

GOVDOC

BRA

3789

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 06584 034 8

BOSTON
PUBLIC
LIBRARY





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Boston Public Library

govdoc

BRA

3789

BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY

BUSINESS DISLOCATION AND RELOCATION
UNDER URBAN RENEWAL:
A STUDY OF 1900 BOSTON FIRMS

by

JOE L. WARD

B. ARCH., UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
(1965)

SUMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER
IN CITY PLANNING

at the

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
January, 1968

Signature of Author _____
Department of City and Regional Planning

Certified by _____
Thesis Supervisor

Accepted by _____
Chairman, Departmental Committee
on Graduate Students

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
77 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

October 2, 1967

Professor John T. Howard, Head
Department of City and Regional Planning
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Dear Professor Howard:

In partial Fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of Master in City Planning, I submit this thesis entitled, "Business Dislocation and Relocation under Urban Renewal: A Study of 1900 Boston Firms."

Sincerely yours,

Joe L. Ward

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank the Business Relocation Department of the Boston Redevelopment Authority for making data and clerical assistance available to me without which this study would not have been possible. I particularly wish to thank Fred Troy and William O'Malley of the relocation staff for their assistance and patience.

I am grateful to the many businessmen of Boston who had the interest and took the time to answer my questionnaire and write of their experiences. I regret that there was not sufficient time to contact and talk with those that extended an invitation.

In addition, I should like to extend my thanks to my friends for their encouragement and willingness to listen to my ideas and complaints. Special thanks must go to Wren McMains and Miss Sara Mills for their assistance in helping me prepare the computer program.

Finally, my thanks go to my thesis advisor, John T. Howard, for his counsel, advice, suggestions, and occasional bits of much needed humor. I appreciated the concern and interest that was shown and the effort made in my behalf.

ABSTRACT

BUSINESS DISLOCATION AND RELOCATION UNDER URBAN RENEWAL: A STUDY OF 1900 BOSTON FIRMS

by
JOE L. WARD

Submitted to the Department of City and Regional
Planning on October 2, 1967, in partial fulfillment
for the degree of Master in City Planning.

The purpose of this thesis was two-fold; first, it attempts to document urban renewal business dislocation activities in the City of Boston and second, an attempt is made to evaluate the conditions under which relocation of the discontinuance of a business occurs. The study was undertaken in the belief that the consequences of renewal action resulting in forced business dislocations have not been adequately and correctly perceived. With the coming recognition of the urban crisis, the inevitable accompaniment of federal programs that the Model Cities Program prefigures, and the increased degree of implementation of the renewal, highway and other programs that cause dislocation, hopefully will also come an increased awareness of the effect of these programs on the business community.

Three basic issue areas were encountered: (1) The characteristics of the firm and the impact of dislocation on the firm; (2) The impact of dislocation on the city; (3) The impact of relocation services on the relocation process.

Under (1) above; (a) Can high discontinuance rates be explained due to a high percentage of marginal firms and the losses therefore be dismissed? (b) What sort of problems and difficulties do the firms encounter? (c) What sort of assistance should be given to the firms?

Under (2) above; (a) What is the impact of the dislocations on the socio-economic fabric of the city? Is the magnitude of displacement sufficiently large enough to cause concern? (b) How have the dislocations affected employment, the relationship between work and place of residence, and the land use pattern of the city?

Under (3) above; (a) Although financial assistance to dislocatees may be morally just, is it also helping to reduce the number or discontinued businesses and employment losses? (b) Have relocation services rendered to dislocated businesses improved or even met the needs of the dislocatee?

The gathering of information to shed some light on the above questions was limited to the nonresidential dislocation and relocation activities of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. The agency cooperated in supplying information on eight renewal projects and the 1900 firms therein that were relocated between 1958 and March, 1967. In addition to this a questionnaire was sent and data was supplied by 240 survey respondents as regards their relocation experiences.

The following major conclusions were drawn from the analysis of the data:

1. Business dislocation is a major factor in the renewal process and the cumulative effects of displacement are considerable. It is estimated that by 1972 one-quarter of all retail firms and manufacturers and approximately one-seventh of all wholesalers and service establishments will have been displaced. Estimated job losses due to discontinuances and departures from the city average respectively .32 and .65 persons per firm displaced. The majority of the job losses due to discontinuances appears to be made up by growth in surviving firms within two to three years after displacement.

2. Business dislocation ^{under} urban renewal and its associated problems are pre-eminently small business problems. The retail and service establishments are the most heavily affected and comprise nearly fifty-five percent of the load.

3. Relocates are generally dependent on a good supply of low-rent space. The rate at which this space becomes available is governed by general business activities and thus the timing of the dislocation load and the magnitude of it appear to be variables influencing the discontinuance rate.

4. Abnormal liquidation rates on displacement occur among nearly all business types and sizes of firms. The rate is highest for the retail and personal service establishments. The majority of the firms are not marginal and it appears that the high rates are the result of forced displacements.

5. Beneficial effects are sometimes realized through the relocation process principally by the wholesale and manufacturing firms. The improvement is an increase in efficiency and is often accompanied by an improvement in the location of the firm and a probable improvement in the land use pattern of the city.

6. Overall business relocation policy and procedures have improved over time. Gradually lower liquidation rates over time have been accompanied by an increasing proportion of the firms that have felt they have received adequate compensation and view the relocation process in a positive manner.

Thesis Supervisor: John T. Howard

Title: Head, Department of City and Regional Planning

iv

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was two-fold; first, it attempts to document business dislocation activities in the City of Boston and second, an attempt is made to evaluate the conditions under which relocation or the discontinuance of a business occurs. The first part involves the scrutinization of the characteristics of the dislocatees and the relocation process in an attempt to determine the difficulties and problems that the relocatees face. This also means a re-evaluation of some of the commonly held beliefs of relocation personnel in a spirit of objective determination that is necessary to establish the needs of the relocatee and the opportunities and possibilities of the relocation program. The second part of the study considers the impact of the dislocation and relocation program, attempts to identify the important elements in the relocation assistance program and illustrate the degree of their effectiveness as part of the total relocation endeavor.

There are three basic issue areas that necessarily must be brought under consideration if the objectives of the study are to be met: the characteristics of the firm and the impact of dislocation on the firm; the impact of dislocation on the city; the impact of relocation services on the relocation process. Primary in the consideration of the characteristics of the firms is the issue of the numbers of marginal businesses, for if the percentage of marginal businesses is high then heavy losses due to discontinuances can be easily explained and dismissed. Also

of importance is whether the individual firms sustain unusual or heavy financial losses that should be rightfully assumed by the public since the dislocations that occur are presumably in the public interest. If the losses to private interests are considerable, then what sort of assistance has been or should be rendered to the firms? It is also important to question the impact of the dislocations on the socio-economic fabric of the city. Is the magnitude of displacement sufficiently large to cause concern? How have the dislocations affected employment, the relationship between work and place of residence, and the land use pattern of the city? Finally, have relocation services rendered to dislocated businesses improved or even met the needs of the dislocatee? Although financial assistance to dislocatees may be morally just, is it also helping to reduce the number of discontinued businesses? Should relocation service efforts be expanded, curtailed or left as they are?

The gathering of information to shed some light on the above questions was limited to the non-residential dislocation and relocation activities of the Boston Redevelopment Authority. The agency cooperated in supplying information on 1900 firms that were relocated between 1958 and March, 1967. The data that was available included information on the types of firms, number of employees, square footage, reimbursements, grants, loans, reasons for discontinuances, and dates of moves, payments and discontinuances. In addition, addresses of relocatees were supplied along with limited clerical help that assisted in the mailing of

a questionnaire. Data supplied by 240 survey respondents in regards to their relocation experiences provided additional information as to the relocation process and the attitudes of the relocatees. Evaluations of the firm characteristics, dislocation impact, and relocation service programs are therefore heavily dependent on the Boston experience and then tempered only by published information generally available. It should be noted that although many critical comments are made on the basis of dislocation and relocation practices in Boston, it was the author's general impression that these practices are at least on a par with those of other agencies throughout the country and in some cases better.

The following conclusions were drawn during the course of the study:

1. Business dislocation is a major factor in the renewal process. Even though yearly displacements affect but a fraction of the total number of employees and firms in the City of Boston, the cumulative effects of displacement are considerable. A significant portion of the entire employment and economy of a city can be affected for by 1972 it is estimated that one-quarter of all retail firms and manufacturers, and approximately one-seventh of all wholesalers and service establishments, will have been displaced.

2. Business dislocation in urban renewal and its associated problems are pre-eminently small business problems. Even though displacement percentages by type of business vary over time, it

is the retail and service establishments that are the most heavily affected and comprise nearly fifty-five percent of the load.

3. Abnormal liquidation rates on displacement occur among nearly all business types and sizes of firms. The percentages for those liquidating varies inversely according to size and the the retail and personal service establishments, particularly the eating, drinking and liquor retail stores and the barber and beauty shops, experience a proportionately greater number of discontinuances.

4. The rate of departure or of terminations of business activities for the city as a whole is apparently a critical factor in successful relocation for the space vacated through such activities appears to provide the bulk of relocation space. The rate at which the space becomes available is due to general business activities and thus the timing of the dislocation load and the magnitude of it appear to be variables influencing the discontinuance rate.

5. It would appear that, although a portion of the dislocated firms and the liquidated firms are undoubtedly marginal in character, the majority are not. Many of the liquidated firms pay average and above average rents, for displacees, and their numbers are not confined to the lower size categories. In addition, the high liquidation rates cannot be associated with high business turnover rates. The conclusion is that the high liquidation rates are the result of forced displacements.

6. Forced dislocation can sometimes have beneficial effects. Although retail and personal service firms suffer adversely and

professional and business service firms negligibly, the whole-sale and manufacturing establishments are often able to take significant advantage of the move. The result is an increase in efficiency, accompanied by an improvement in the location of the firm and a probable improvement in the land use pattern of the city - an improvement due to the move, relocation, not redevelopment per se.

7. Discontinuance of activity due to retirement is the reason most often given for the failure to relocate. A difficult problem exists in the displacement of firms operated by elderly businessmen. Due to the age of the displacee, problems arise in financing the move and, with the physical and emotional stamina required to make the move, result in social costs to the elderly.

8. The process of relocating a business involves many problems that the businessman cannot control, introduces problems that he is unable to anticipate and that require decision making beyond his experience and information beyond his reach. Among these are the following:

(a) The inability to control the time of the move resulting in uncertainty and confusion.

(b) The loss of sales, customers, and income prior to the move.

(c) The inability to control the pressures placed upon the real estate market and the resulting higher rents and decreasing volume of suitable low rent space.

(d) The adoption of irrational attitudes toward relocation by some businessmen that appears to be from a high degree of emotional and economic involvement in the business.

(e) The lack of sufficient time, knowledge, and information to consider alternatives as to location, type and size of building space, financing and staging.

(f) The lack of familiarity with real estate transactions, negotiations and financing procedures.

(g) The licensing and zoning problems.

(h) The retraining of employees.

(i) The vagaries of the adjustment period after the move.

9. Overall business relocation policy and procedures have improved over time. Gradually lower liquidation rates over time have been accompanied by an increasing proportion of the firms that felt they have received adequate compensation and view the relocation process in a positive manner. Nearly one-third of the relocatee survey respondents felt that they would not have been able to remain in business without compensation.

10. The Small Business Displacement Payment (SBDP) is an effective addition to the compensation received for moving expenses and property losses. Its area of coverage, according to the type and size of business receiving the payment, conforms nicely to the characteristics of the liquidated firms. Checks on the adequacy of compensation and attitudes of the firms disclose significant improvements at the time the program was introduced.

11. The small business disaster loan program as presently applied under urban renewal relocation conditions would appear to be underutilized and therefore ineffective. The load coverage by size of business fails to conform to the size characteristics of all displacees. The one-third maximum floor area size increase allowed recipients of the loans is regressive the smaller the firm.

12. The estimated job losses due to discontinuances averages about .32 persons per firm displaced and the number of jobs lost to the city through departures of firms to outlying areas is estimated to be about .65 jobs per firm displaced. By 1972, estimated job losses in Boston under present and past relocation practices and market conditions should have reached totals of 1,280 from discontinuances and about 2,400 due to departures for a total loss to the city of 3,680 jobs. In addition, it appeared that after two to three years a majority of the job losses due to discontinuances had been made up by growth in the surviving, relocated firms.

13. The redevelopment authority and the Small Business Administration have not adequately attempted to cope with the difficulties of the dislocatees. Beyond the processing of claims and applications for grants little has been done to provide that type of dislocatee (small retail and personal service establishment) with the higher liquidation rates with informational and technical assistance. The problem has been compounded by the authority's reluctance to become involved actively in the real

estate market and the dislocatees' disinclination to trust the authorities and to accept advice.

Since 1956 the major advances in the relocation of businesses have been in the area of financial assistance with the exception perhaps, of phased project takings that reduce the detrimental affects of takings in different portions of a project area. Instead of individual takings throughout a project area, different portions can be scheduled for takings at different times and therefore a retail area might be delimited and scheduled for a taking before a nearby residential area or manufacturing area that contributed to retail sales and in this way a loss of business due to a loss of customers could be partially avoided. Aside from the introduction of this very basic technique little has been done to provide non-cash services to the dislocated businessman. It seems also true that if further advances are to be made in relocating businesses, they must come in this area. Although efforts should be made to insure that a greater number of businesses are reimbursed for expenses and more receive SBA loans, even these efforts must be based on a better relationship between the LPA and the relocatee. The basic legislation for reimbursements, grants and loans is now quite adequate and also exists for the provision of non-cash services but the implementation of a service program has yet to be effectuated.

There are many reasons contributing to the lack of the initiation of a service program. Many agencies are apparently

understaffed and over worked now without taking on the added burden of the provision of adequate services. Most have probably not been able even to stop and evaluate the services they are now providing. The agencies also have a recruitment problem often stemming from the low salaries that are paid. In addition to the agencies' personnel problems, there is the ever present erroneous attitude that the majority of the businesses are marginal and thus implicitly worth only marginal relocation efforts and this is further compounded by the belief that the government should interfere as little as possible with free enterprise and the real estate market. Thus the usually implicit argument is that businesses can be compensated for losses due to forced dislocation, if they can be easily quantified, but not for the conversion of the new property or any upgrading of the business. The reservations seem to be based on the belief that a certain competitive business aura would be upset and the government would find itself in the position of improving the competitive position of the relocated business. Such a position ignores the impact dislocation activities have already had on the Boston business community. Another difficulty in establishing services is the attitude of the businessman who seems to be inherently distrustful, and understandably so, of the renewal agency that has the power of eminent domain. Is the business that may be fighting the LPA in court over a property loss or settlement, also supposed to be trustingly accepting the advice of LPA relocation officials as to possible locations, marketing techniques and managerial assistance?

Nevertheless, the groundwork for meaningful communication and cooperation between the relocation officials and the displacees has already been set and needs exploitation - business relocation with its negative overtones should be changed into a positive process. The reimbursements provided for moving expenses and property losses provide an excellent means for the "introduction" of the agency to the businessman and could be used to solicit a favorable reaction; the SBDP for the smaller firms provides an added enticement. The initial favorable impression could be held by improving the reimbursement procedures and there are several simple steps, such as the adoption of fixed payment schedules and cost accounting procedures, that could be reasonably implemented.

The following goals, recommendations and objectives are suggested for consideration and further development:

I. GOAL: To provide a higher number of opportunities for successfully relocating firms and changing functional city areas.

A. Recommendations

1. A continuous source of information on anticipated land use and activity changes, the real estate market, and general business activity should be made available by the redevelopment authority. In particular, the expected changes to occur within and peripheral to project areas should be spelled out - changes that might include population shifts, zoning adjustments, and intended renewal efforts to enhance activity centers or generally change patterns of business activity.

2. Different types of problems should require the development of different types of solutions; the retail and personal service establishments are inherently different from the manufacturing firms.

a. Retail and Personal Service Establishments

1. An intensive canvassing for available space resources within one-quarter to one-half mile of the project area.
2. A local market analysis to determine the effects of population shifts and the desirability of surrounding business locations for various types of firms.
3. The development of space priorities for the relocation of firms into other renewal areas.
4. A means of encouraging displacees to form redevelopment corporations and cooperatives that might enable them to obtain land, secure financing and provide needed shopper amenities and services.
5. The provision of assistance in the marketing and display of goods.

b. Wholesale and Manufacturing Firms

1. The provision of technical assistance as to changes in layout and improvements in operations.
2. The provision of assistance in the preparation of complex staging operations to lessen an interruption in business due to the move.
3. The formation of industrial parks prior to dislocation with priorities given to dislocatees.

4. The promotion of industrial redevelopment corporations.
5. The exploitation of the positive aspects of forced dislocation, i.e., the chance to upgrade a business through the disaster loan program.

3. The gathering and processing of the information should be complemented by an active program to disseminate it. Personal and group efforts should be made to increase the meaningful amount of communication between the dislocatees, the business community, and the renewal authority.

AA. Objectives

1. To further rationalize the many decision making efforts undertaken by both the agency and the hundreds of dislocatees.
2. To improve the land use pattern of the city.
3. To acquaint the authority with the full consequences of the intended alternative planning proposals so as to influence the timing, staging, magnitude and probable impact of the relocation loads on the city.
4. To evaluate the work of the relocation personnel - to help acquaint them with the changing needs, problems and attitudes of the dislocatees.
5. To inform the dislocatees of market and activity changes that may affect their business operations; to lessen their often unfounded fears of relocation; and to prepare them with information and techniques to make a successful move.

B. Recommendation

An evaluation of the supply of medium to low rent building space and the development of alternatives to its destruction, for example:

(a) The use of rehabilitation and conversion techniques in business real estate.

(b) The development and use of ways of making dissimilar land uses compatible, of integrating them into the new environment in such a way as to make dislocation unnecessary.

BB. Objectives

1. To preserve some of the suitable low rent building space on which a successful and continuing relocation program would appear to be dependent.

2. To lower the discontinuances and departure losses to the city and financial losses to the businessman.

C. Recommendation

1. The policy on disbursements should be overhauled and built on a statistical basis. It is proposed that all firms should receive a minimum payment according to the size of the firm and its probable disbursement. The payment should be made prior to dislocation and the firm should then have the option of later filing for additional sums to cover entire property losses and moving expenses.

2. A cost accounting and research program should be undertaken to determine when total or partial reimbursements for new and improved facilities might prove beneficial to all parties.

3. The Small Business Administration's disaster loan program should be made into a viable program that provides financial assistance to an increased number of dislocatees. SBA officials should join with the renewal officials in the attempt to increase the amount of communication with the businessman. The maximum limit on the allowable increase in space should be changed for the small firm.

CC. Objectives

1. To improve the relationship between the dislocatee and all participating agencies.

2. To upgrade the existing programs.

II. GOAL: To provide fair and equitable treatment and to fulfill an extended obligation of just compensation.

A. Recommendations

1. All moving expenses and property losses should be borne as mandatory costs of the renewal program.

2. The practical success of the disbursement and displacement payment programs as well as the moral obligation to provide such assistance to forced dislocatees justifies the extension of these efforts to other federal and federally assisted programs.

3. Every effort should be made to keep the numbers of firms not receiving disbursements to a minimum.

4. Coordination with other governmental agencies should be maintained to assure the retraining and employment of

displaced employees. Special attention should be given to the elderly; a consideration which might include financial assistance and the help of social workers.

B. Objectives

1. To have the economic and social costs of renewal borne by the public.

2. To lower the discontinuance and departure losses to the city and the financial losses to the businessman.

BACKGROUND

Concern over the actions and consequences of forced business dislocations by public agencies is a fairly recent one that has seen the first meaningful legislation on the subject developed only a decade ago. Under the power of eminent domain certain governmental authorities have the right to acquire private property against the owner's will for use for the public good provided that the owner has been justly compensated for his loss. Traditionally the problem of what is just and what can be compensated has been left to the courts with the result that until recently, compensation was paid solely for the transfer of property and the ensuing litigation was primarily concerned with the determination of what was a fair and reasonable price. Historically the government used the power of eminent domain only for small takings, for example, the acquisition of sites for schools and court houses; the one exception to this was probably the fairly extensive takings made by the railroads. Only after the Second World War did the magnitude of the takings reach such proportions to be of concern and this was due primarily to the development of the urban renewal and interstate highway programs.¹

Displacements due to all federal or federally assisted programs have averaged about 10,900 firms per year for the last

¹Relocation: Unequal Treatment of People and Businesses Displaced by the Government. (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations), p. 4.

three years. Of this total the renewal program accounted for nearly 66 percent and the highway programs for another 29%, or approximately 7,180 businesses per year. Slightly more than one-half of the displacements are due to the taking of structures and property that are tenant occupied and of course these concerns do not share in any of the compensation given for real property.

Displacements are expected to increase substantially from the current 10,900 firms to over 17,800 firms per year. Of that total about 13,120 firms may be expected to be dislocated under the urban renewal program and by 1972 the cumulative total should reach over 100,000 firms.²

The displaced firms incur considerable costs as a consequence of the takings which may be due to a variety of reasons such as the moving and installation of heavy equipment, the refurbishing of a commercial establishment, and losses incurred due to a loss of business prior to acquisition or the interruption of business activities as a consequence of the move. In Boston over 5% of the displacees have had moving expenses in excess of \$10,000 and a majority have incurred moving costs of over \$1,000.³ The argument is therefore usually made that since the takings are for the public good then in all fairness the individuals affected should not have to bear the costs and damages. Furthermore, since

²Study of Compensation and Assistance for Persons Affected by Real Property Acquisition in Federal and Federally Assisted Programs. (Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives), pp. 26, 272 and 258.

³Appendix, p. 126.

compensation is legally required for the taking of real property then it is not morally just that compensation should not also be given for the damages sustained as a consequence of the taking - damages sustained by renters and lessees as well as property owners. Another argument is that the failure to compensate only serves to increase the burden on the city and other governmental agencies that are attempting to improve the economic vitality of the city or open up more job opportunities.

The urban renewal program is essentially a federal-local program that was initiated under the 1949 Housing Act. Very little attention was paid to the subject of business relocation; however, the relocation of families was deemed a public responsibility. Yet, even though financial relocation assistance was authorized for families, it was considered simply as a means of expediting relocation procedure and thus redevelopment.⁴ The housing act viewed renewal primarily as a matter of providing housing and the clearance of slums and little consideration was taken of the business that would be affected and no provisions were made for their relocation. Not until 1954 did it become apparent that redevelopment required the provision of services and jobs in addition to housing and in 1954 the housing act was amended to permit the Housing Administration to devote federal monies to a maximum of 10% of that available to projects of

⁴Relocation: Unequal Treatment, p. 17.

non-residential purpose. The requirement was also made that the area under consideration had to be substantially occupied by slums. Later in 1959 the slum restriction was removed and the percentage allotment was increased to twenty. Another increase was made in 1961 when the allotment was raised to 30% and again in 1965 when it reached its present value of 35%. These funds were made available as project funds and were apparently seen as necessary to enable local authorities to provide a mix of residential and commercial and industrial services - they were not devoted to relocation costs.⁵

It was not until 1956 that Congress saw fit to assure that displacees could receive compensation as a matter of right. HHFA, through the Urban Renewal Authority, made known the changes to the local public agencies:

The Housing Act of 1956, enacted August 7, 1956, amends Title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, by adding a new section 106(f) which provides that Title I projects may include the making of relocation payments to individuals, families, and business concerns displaced by an urban renewal project...(payment) shall not exceed \$100 in the case of an individual or family, or \$2,000 in the case of a business concern.⁶

It should be noted that the amendment was a permissive one for it did not require that authorities make relocation payments only that they may do so.⁷ It is interesting to note the

⁵ Rutherford Platt, Background Paper No. 1, Changing Congressional Provisions for Small Business Displaced by Urban Renewal (Chicago, 1966).

⁶ LPA Letter No. 80 (Urban Renewal Administration, 1956)p.1.

⁷ LPA Letter No. 134 (Urban Renewal Administration, 1957)p.3.

Authority's reaction to the change for they commented that the payment, when combined with adequate relocation services, should improve the relocation process and to the exclusion of any comment on business concerns concluded:

Effective utilization of these payments may well reduce the number of "disappeared" families and facilitate the rehousing of families in "decent, safe, and sanitary accommodations." ⁸

The compensation allowed for moving expenses and property losses to businesses has become more liberal since 1956. In 1957 the maximum payment was raised to \$2,500 and then it was raised again in 1959 to \$3,000. In 1961 the limit on moving expenses was eliminated and the \$3,000 maximum only applied if both moving and property losses were to be reimbursed; however, in 1962 a maximum payment for moving expenses was set at \$25,000 and the \$3,000 limitation remained. Thus the firm that discontinued operations and typically sustained a property loss due to the forced sale of equipment and goods is eligible for maximum reimbursement of \$3,000. The firm that relocates or plans to re-establish and also sustains property losses due to a forced sale, may be compensated for both moving expenses and property loss to a maximum of \$3,000 or, if moving expenses alone exceed \$3,000, may be compensated only for that to a maximum of \$25,000.

In 1965 the maximum payment permitted was again modified to

⁸ LPA Letter No. 80. p. 1.

allow payments in excess of \$25,000 if the local public agency would pick up one-third to one-quarter, dependent on the type of grant, of the costs above that figure.⁹

As has been pointed out, the number of firms incurring moving expenses or property losses in excess of \$25,000 is very small and runs just a little over 1% of the total and thus for the purposes of analysis and evaluation, the changes after 1961 are quite insignificant for the vast majority of the firms.

Three other series of directives have been contained in the housing acts and of these probably the most significant has been the development of the Small Business Displacement Payment or the SBDP. The SBDP is a grant to cover loss of income and profits, monies and time spent incidental to moving, loss of good will, and generally for adjustment either to a new location after relocation or to unemployment and loss of income due to the discontinuance or liquidation of the business. The first grants were authorized as of January 27, 1964, under the 1964 Housing Act and were for \$1500, an amount that was later raised in 1965 to \$2,500. The award of the grant was conditional on several points with the most important being that the business was established in a project area at the time of approval; that gross receipts of sales of the business totaled over \$1,500 and an average annual net income before taxes and including certain wages, salaries, etc., did not exceed a maximum of \$10,000, and that the firm had filed income tax returns with the Internal

⁹Platt, Background Paper No. 1, p. 18, also see the Urban Renewal Manual, Sec. SS3.110, and LPA Letter No. 362.

Revenue Service. The conditions thus effectively limit the size of the business that may receive the grant.¹⁰

Another program was initiated through the Small Business Administration in 1961 that extended the coverage of that agency's disaster loan program to displaced businesses. The program was intended to ease the financial difficulties of firms engaged in relocation and to provide them with sufficient capital to carry the concern in the adjustment period, to allow it to make improvements and pay for replacement expenses for obsolete equipment, and to enable the firm to purchase machinery and equipment to upgrade its facilities. The initial twenty year term limit of the loan was extended in 1965 to thirty years and in 1964 a modification was made that allowed the loan to be used for new construction. The loans require less collateral than normal, i.e., more liberal financing and securing arrangements, and provide monies at below market rates; the SBA loan rate is currently at 4¼%.¹¹

The other relocation assistance program consists of counselling services but the extent and quality of the services has apparently not been well stipulated by the Urban Renewal Authority. Not until 1964 was it required that the local public agency must establish a service program and in 1965 the directive

¹⁰Platt, P. 18 and LPA Letter No. 362.

¹¹Handbook for Participation Loans with the Small Business Administration, (Small Business Administration, 1966) pp. 99-100.

was extended to require the LPA's to supply real estate information to displacees. In addition, the SBA was directed to supplement the LPA in rendering assistance, a service that it was already empowered to provide under the Small Business Act.¹²

The Boston Redevelopment Authority provides those services that are required under the housing act and as a matter of policy suggests relocation resources, aids in locational studies, provides a referral service to the Massachusetts Department of Commerce or the SBA for technical advice and loans, and processes claims for moving expenses and property losses and applications for SBDP grants. A very high portion of relocation assistance is confined to the evaluation and processing of claims and of providing information and assistance to the relocatee in filing his claim. The present organization consists of a central business relocation staff whose function is to coordinate city-wide activities and examine, audit, and approve the claims, and of site office organizations in each of the major project areas that offer assistance and instructions for preparation and filing of the claim and help the relocatee determine what actions and costs are compensable.

The Boston renewal program has been a fairly extensive one and promises to continue to be so. There have been nine major projects started or completed by 1967 and of these, business relocation information was available on the following eight:

¹²Platt, p. 18. See also: Organization and Operation of Small Business Administration, (House of Representatives, Washington, 1964), p. 3.

West End, Government Center, Washington Park, Waterfront, Charlestown, South Cove, South End, and Castle Square. The ninth project, the New York Streets industrial project, was already completed and data was not readily available. The information as summarized in the appendix is quite complete for both the West End (313 firms) and the Government Center (849 firms) and the number of firms yet to be displaced from the Washington Park Project (281 firms) is probably very small. The first phase of relocation scheduled for the Waterfront Project (178 firms of 285) is nearly completed and of the other four projects which have been grouped under the "other projects" classification, only the Castle Square Project with a fairly heavy displacement load in 1963-64 has been completed. As a group, the displacements from the other projects have reached but about one-quarter of the nearly 1000 that are anticipated.¹³

The West End project area was a predominantly residential area that was typified by high land coverages and a heavy percentage of dilapidated and substandard dwelling units. The vacancy ratio was about 5% as against 1% for the city and the rentals in the area were depressed by approximately 50% or a \$26 rate versus a comparable \$38.40 rate for the rest of the city. Commercial areas were frequently mixed in with residential buildings on extremely narrow streets.¹⁴ As has been adequately

¹³ Industrial and Commercial Business Relocation in the City of Boston (Boston Redevelopment Authority, 1966), Table I, and see the Appendix, pp. , 7, 12, 17, 22, 27.

¹⁴ West End Project Report (Boston Housing Authority, 1953).

pointed in various sociological studies, the area had a high concentration of Italians and other ethnic groups that had developed a particular life style that could probably be likened to the North End. Whatever the conclusions these studies may have drawn, it would appear that from a business viewpoint the area was in an advanced state of decay and that the firms were typically smaller, even for relocation firms, and had a much lower rent structure than for the rest of the city.¹⁵ Some of the different types of businesses were not to be easily found in other areas of the city for tattoo shops, push-cart storage areas, and even a horse liniment firm were to be displaced.

Dislocations of businesses in the Government Center Project got under way in 1962 with the heaviest dislocation load of 465 businesses in a single year. This nearly total clearance area was predominantly commercial and industrial and was contiguous to the West End, bounded by the Central Artery on the east and at the eastern end of the Boston CBD. Because of the close proximity to the West End and the tendency of dislocated businessmen to relocate near their former place of business, many of the relocatees from the West End and from the earlier Central Artery Highway Project, were forced to move again. Unlike the West End the takings were phased to minimize the detrimental effects of takings in one section of the project area

¹⁵Appendix, pp. 10 and 47.

from severely hurting business activity in areas yet to be designated for acquisition. This fairly simple act, combined with an effort to increase and maintain contact with the relocatees as regards moving and reimbursements available, appears to have rendered one of the most significant reductions in the rate of discontinuances. Several qualifications must be made however, for as will be discussed later the size of the firms and the amount of the payments increased at this time; this would also serve to reduce the liquidation rate. Although the taking area was largely commercial and industrial, the proposed new uses have largely centered around governmental activities with over 70% of the land not devoted to public rights of way assigned for this use.¹⁶

In 1963 two other projects besides the Government Center began producing sizeable dislocation loads. The Washington Park Project, Boston's first neighborhood rehabilitation project, went into execution at this time. It is an area of about 150 acres situated several miles from the central business district and inhabited principally by non-whites. The renewal action contemplated was to consist of a combination of clearance and redevelopment activities that included extensive use of rehabilitation techniques and also the introduction of public improvements and services.¹⁷ Displacement activities were to,

¹⁶ Urban Renewal Project Characteristics (Department of Housing and Urban Development) and Appendix pp. 12-16.

¹⁷ Urban Renewal Plan, Washington Park Renewal Area (Boston Redevelopment Authority, 1963) p. 5. See Appendix, pp. 17-21.

or have affected, over 1500 families and 280 businesses. Of the businesses, about 62% were retail trade establishments and partly because of this higher than normal percentage, the liquidation rate of about 26% is higher than normal. The second project, Castle Square, was undertaken at about the same time and the data for this project comprises most of the early dislocation load presented on the data sheets as Other Projects. Not quite 170 businesses were dislocated from this project which lies quite close to the city core and is being developed into a middle and lower-middle class residential area with some retail and service shops.

In 1964 another project, the Waterfront, was started which comprises about eighty acres that lie on either side of the Central Artery between the Harbor and the south side of the Government Center Project. Of the nearly 180 firms thus far taken, about 60% were in manufacturing or wholesaling as versus the norm of 23% and only about one-quarter were in retailing or services (the norm is a base value established from the data on all 1900 firms) compared to a norm of about 56%.¹⁸ This almost exclusively commercial area formerly accepted displacees from the Central Artery and Government Center project areas which means that many of the businesses have either had to move previously or have been affected peripherally by public land takings around and among them. Some efforts have been made by the renewal authority

¹⁸ Appendix, pp. 22-26.

to promote joint moves and formations of cooperatives among the many meat, fruit and produce merchants, and the fish dealers in the area. The formation of cooperatives and group moves facilitates the financing of the new location and the joint use of services and distribution facilities.

Other group displacements and cooperative efforts in moving are being promoted among the florist wholesalers and suppliers in the South End Project Area and among the garment manufacturers, wholesalers and manufacturers' representatives in the Central Business District project areas. These two projects along with the Charlestown, and South Cove projects have only recently been started and have thus far produced minimal dislocation loads. They have therefore been grouped together with the Castle Square project and designated, for purposes of discussion, as Other Projects. The business displacements have so far been smaller both in terms of the number of square feet of floor space occupied and in the number of persons employed than all the other projects with the exception of the West End. These projects have also had a high 47% of all displaced businesses in the retail trade category as compared to the normal one-third.¹⁹

Between 1958 and 1962 nearly 100% of the dislocation loads were due to activities in either the West End or Government Center Projects; however, since that period an increasing number

¹⁹ Appendix, pp. 27-31.

of projects has been introduced so that no one project accounts for the total loads. As one might expect different projects do dominate different sectors of the load by type of business. For example, the Government Center accounts for two-thirds of the wholesale businesses in 1963 and under 10% thereafter whereas the Waterfront displacees accounted for 50% of the 1964 load and over two-thirds of it after that date. Most of the displacements from the Washington Park Project occurred from 1963 to 1965 with peak loading during 1964. In 1966 and 1967 the dominant loads were supplied by the Waterfront or "Other" projects with the exception of the service category where the Government Center displacees still comprised a significant portion of the load.²⁰

This study analyzes data on 1900 firms. All of the site-occupant, disbursement, grant and SBA loan information was made available to the author by the Boston Redevelopment Authority. The information on firm characteristics was collected by the BRA during survey and planning phase of the renewal process and in the dislocation process itself. Three intermediate steps involving data transfer and possible error took place before the data was ready for final computer processing by the author. Although the author has no knowledge of the accuracy of the first step performed by the BRA in the survey and transferral of

²⁰ Appendix, pp. 2-3.

information of this information to file cards, the second step of transferring this information to tally sheets and the third step of punching computer data cards were performed almost solely by the author with reasonable care. An error checking system to scrutinize the raw data was built into the computer program that was designed to discard and describe gross inconsistencies of information.

The post-relocation survey information was collected solely under the direction of the author and with the exception of some clerical assistance rendered by the BRA in the mailing of the questionnaires, was also solely processed by him. Once again the computer error checking system was used.

The process of evaluating the data was inherent in the different stages of the data manipulation. First, in the transfer of data from the BRA forms, consistency and care in recording information was scrutinized. The early data, that prior to 1960, and principally on the West End Project, was carelessly and haphazardly collected. Information on the number of employees affected is totally lacking and the number of "unknown" types and sizes of firms runs abnormally high.²¹ The data on firms dislocated after 1960 is of uniform character and of apparently good quality. Second, the survey information was checked for the bias that is nearly always present in some form in such endeavors. The questionnaires were sent to all

²¹Appendix, p. 8.

relocated firms for which the BRA had recorded addresses and this meant the returns were highest for those most recently relocated. The businesses that answered were also larger on the whole than those that had been relocated and there also tended to be a higher number of responses from service and professional persons that presumably reflects a higher percentage of the better educated in this group.²² Therefore, where the data was felt to be sufficiently extensive, it has been presented by both type of business and size of business to allow the reader to compensate for the differences that have occurred. Because the survey data was not collected on a 100% sample basis there is still a chance of error. However, as with the BRA site-occupant information, the data was compared, when possible, to that presented by other studies and no noticeable inconsistencies were found. This third check suggests that some of the more original data should also be quite valid but of course it does not preclude the necessity of further efforts and research.

In summary, we may note that although the right of governmental agencies to acquire property was established under constitutional law, it was not until after the Second World War that the magnitude of the takings became great enough to generate interest and concern for those suffering from damages

²² Appendix, pp. 32-35.

incidental to the takings and not sharing in the compensation for the taking of real property. Failure to compensate for incidental damages has been attacked on the grounds that it is morally unfair not to compensate for clearly established costs incidental to the takings, just as it would likewise have been unfair not to pay just compensation for the taking of private real property for the public interest. Furthermore, it may be argued that failure to compensate simply increases the problem of acquiring the property, providing job opportunities, and generally preserving the economic vitality of the cities. Current takings nationally have averaged nearly 11,000 firms per year and this figure is expected to increase largely due to expanded activities in the renewal and highway programs to over 17,000 firms per year. According to data available in Boston, the incidental costs for moving and property losses are substantial and are in excess of \$1,000 for the majority of dislocatees.

Compensation for incidental damages incurred by renewal dislocatees was not authorized until 1956, seven years after the initiation of the renewal program. Since then increasingly liberal payments were authorized through 1962. In 1964 compensation for moving expenses and property losses have been supplemented for the smaller firms by the Small Business Displacement Payment, a grant paid to ease the burden of relocation or liquidation. In 1962 the Small Business

Administration was authorized to supplement the work of the Local Public Agencies by providing loans and helping to provide technical and managerial assistance.

Dislocation services throughout the country typically emphasize financial assistance and Boston is no exception. Although some effort is made to provide counseling services for relocatees the majority of the agency's relocation effort is currently expended in processing claims.

The total dislocation study load of 1900 Boston firms to date is an agglomerate of loads from a number of different projects and scattered sites throughout the city. The renewal efforts have varied from total clearance to residential rehabilitation and the areas designated for land takings ranged from predominantly commercial, to predominantly residential.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIRMS

The analysis of the characteristics of the firms has been separated into two parts. The first discusses the general characteristics of all dislocated firms and the special difficulties they face in attempting relocation. The second part is a closer look at the firms by four major types of businesses. As we shall see, the complexities of a forced dislocation are some times obscured if the problem is considered as one monolithic mass. Data has actually been collected and presented according to six major classifications and often reference will be made to all, however, it is felt that an analysis of wholesale, retail, service and manufacturing establishments will be sufficient to allow the reader to lucidly comprehend the situation.

The business displacement program in Boston has been an extremely active one. Since 1958 over six million square feet of floor space have been acquired by the redevelopment authority. In five more years, if highway takings are included, that total will have reached an estimated 14.5 million square feet. To date these takings have affected over eight and one-half thousand employees and by 1972 will be two and one-quarter times that. Such figures can only accrue over a period of time - an opportunity is thus furnished to enable us to take a look at this process in time as well as in depth.

The maximum number of firms displaced in any one year was in 1962 when approximately 460 were affected. Indeed, in 1962 and 1963 over 40% of the 1900+ firms displaced since 1958 were taken. The erratic loading varies not only for all firms but for different types of firms as well. In those same two years, for instance, approximately 55% of all manufacturing firms were displaced.

Retail and service establishments typically form the major part of the relocation loads. Together they accounted for over 55% of the total load and one of every three firms displaced was a retail establishment. Wholesale and manufacturing firms account for 23% and the remaining 20% is comprised of firms in the storage and distribution and "other" categories. This "other" category is comprised of finance and real estate firms, rooming houses, nonprofit clubs and corporations and other, nondesignated establishments.

Other reports from various parts of the country have indicated that firms found in renewal areas are typically small. Boston is no exception for over 65% occupied quarters that were under 3000 square feet. Sixty percent of all firms employed three persons or under and at least 80 percent of the firms employed eight persons or less. The median size of the firms has varied little over the years, and as the appendix tables (p. 43 and 45) show, the median square footage runs a steady 500± and the median number of employees is also steady at about three.

Renewal firms fall into the lower range of rental categories and 8% pay below \$.25/sq./ft./year. Furthermore, over 50% pay between \$.25 and \$1.50. This fairly low rental structure is one of the prime reasons for the location of firms in renewal designated areas. Rentals paid by dislocated firms as a group have been steadily increasing as the circled median values on appendix table p. 47 indicate. The increases have occurred in three steps. The first stage was in 1958 to 1960, the years of the West End project takings. As was explained earlier, the data available for this period is not the best due to the poor records kept at this time and the rents that were recorded were those that were actually paid at that time to the redevelopment authority. They were constantly being lowered in order to offset the heavy loss of business and customers - a condition that was apparently much more frequent then, than now after relocation personnel have learned to stage their takings. It is also true that this area undoubtedly had one of the lowest rent structures in the city. The findings are not too inconsistent with those generally reported for the area - a fact that substantiated its designation as the first of Boston's renewal projects. Median rents in the first stage ran about \$.50 to \$.75; in the period 1961 to 1963 the median was steady at about \$.75 to \$1.00. This, the second stage, was dominated by the Government Center Project and it would appear that

median rents have actually climbed very little since that time. The third stage, median rents at about \$1.00 to \$1.50, is due to the larger number of business service and professional firms that were dislocated after 1964, most notably attorneys and CPA's. The professionals typically pay high, office space rents as will be shown under that section on service and professional firms. The result is, of course, that the median rental for all firms is biased.¹ Rentals vary inversely with the size of the firm. Firms employing one to five persons pay a median rental between \$1.00 and \$1.49/per sq. ft./per year and for those employing between six and twenty the rate drops to \$.75 to \$1.00. Only six percent of all dislocated firms employ more than 20 persons and they pay the lowest median rents between \$.50 and \$.75/sq. ft.²

Typical business discontinuance rates throughout the nation run between six and eleven percent per annum dependent on the type of business, its size, and number of years in business. National liquidation rates for businesses dislocated from renewal areas run two to three times that. In Boston over one such business in every five has discontinued. The rate of liquidation has not been constant and for all business it has declined from highs of 45% in 1958 generally downward to lows of from 17 to 22 percent in 1964 to 1966. A rise in the rate is apparent in 1966 and up even more sharply for the first quarter of 1967. It is not too

surprising to find that liquidation rates tend to vary inversely with the size of the firm. Approximately one in four, one to three person firms liquidates, whereas only about one in five firms that employ between four and seven liquidate. After that, the rate drops sharply, for in the eight to twenty range it is only 10% and over that, somewhere between zero and five.⁵

Approximately 1/10th of all displacement has occurred among wholesale firms. Of the 203 firms concerned about one-third were in food and the rest were in a variety of other categories. Forty percent of the displacement occurred in 1962 and 1963 and to date over 1.7 million square feet of floor space has been acquired and over 1500 employees affected. By 1972 an estimated 280 firms will have been displaced and the cumulative totals of building space will have risen to 3.8 million square feet and the number of employees to over 4000.

Wholesale firms are typically larger than most displaced firms. The median square footage per firm runs about two to three times higher than that for all firms and has been fairly steady over time at about 3000 feet square. Excluding the highest and lowest values, averages over the years ranged from 5,100 to 10,300 with general highs in the years 1962 and 1963 and from that time on they have been generally steady. Whereas seventy percent of all establishments were under 3000 square feet only 37% of all wholesale firms were under that.

The firms are also larger employers than average. Only 35% of the wholesale firms employed under 3 persons versus the 60% value for all firms. The median size has been steady at about five in comparison to the two to three persons for all firms and the average fluctuates between six and eleven persons with highs in 1962-63, lows in 1963 - 65 and highs again in 1966 - 67. For all wholesale firms the average amount of floor space used per employee runs from 800 to 1100 sq. ft. with highs once again in the years 1962 and 1963.

Normal liquidation rates for wholesale firms have averaged about seven percent, but in the renewal areas they have been two to three times that with an overall total of 17%. No trends are apparent, in part probably due to the absence of a relocation load in the earlier years. Even so highs have occurred in 1964 and 1965 in contrast to lower rates for all firms during those years. In 1966 the rate dropped to 11 percent but in the first quarter of 1967 had risen to nearly double that.⁶

Retail establishments account for one third of all displaced firms and of that about $\frac{1}{4}$ are liquor stores and eating and drinking establishments. Of the remaining 75%, about 16% are grocery stores, 20% have been classified as "other" and the remainder are fairly well distributed among the hardware, drygoods, clothing, and furniture and appliance classifications. By 1967 over 1.6 million square

feet of retail space had been acquired; it is a figure that is expected to increase to over 3.1 million in the next five to six years. The number of employees affected by 1972 will probably more than double from the present 2200. Although one third of all firms displaced were retail firms only $\frac{1}{4}$ of all employees worked in retail establishments.

Retail firms are slightly smaller than the average displacee. About 62% employed less than three persons and 84% employed less than eight persons in comparison to the 60% and 80% respective totals for all firms. The median size for all retail firms is steady over the years at three employees. The averages do fluctuate and run from 3 to 8 persons if the extremes are ignored. Highs occurred in 1962 and 63 and again in 1966 and 1967 - the same pattern as that for wholesale firms.

The median floor space occupied by retail establishments is slightly higher than that for all firms and is steady over time at about 1-3000 square feet. The average square footage, once again ignoring the extremes, fluctuates between 1400 and 3900 sq. ft. with lower values in the earlier years 1958 to 1960. Although the median size of retail firms by space occupied is slightly higher than is typical, nearly 75% of the firms do occupy less than 3000 sq. ft. compared to about 70% for all firms.

Liquidations among displaced retail firms are much more frequent than for any other category. The rate is over

1½ times that for all firms and stands at about 35%. This means that of all discontinuances, retail firms account for one-half. The normal national rate runs at about eight percent, thus the rate under conditions of forced displacement from renewal areas is about four times this norm. A heavy percentage of the displacements occurs among liquor, and eating and drinking establishments. These subcategories have rates slightly less than 60%. Such rates are equalled only by the rooming house subcategory. The reasons for the high rates among the liquor establishments are connected with licensing problems whereas the rooming house can be regarded as a particularly unique piece of real estate. A more detailed discussion occurs in that portion of the thesis dealing with survival and discontinuances. The trend of the retail liquidation rate is an interesting one for it is high in the years 1958 to 1960 at about 40 to 50 percent and then drops to lows of from 26 to 32 percent in the middle years of 1962 to 1964. Thus the period of highest relocation loads is accompanied by the lowest liquidation rates. After 1964 the rate begins to climb again and the first quarter of 1967 is up sharply from the year before at a new high of over 50%.⁷

Personal and business service and professional firms comprise over one-fifth of the total relocation load. The personal service firms accounted for about one-half of the total service category; there has, however, been an increasing

proportion of the total category that is composed of business services and professionals. In the years 1958 to 1960 there were about four to five times as many personal service firms and in 1961 to 1963 they were only 50 to 70% of the total service load. From 1964 on, the proportion has become even smaller and is currently between 20 and 50%. To date about $\frac{1}{2}$ million square feet of building space has been acquired but by 1972 the total is expected to reach over two million. The displacement loads have not been nearly as erratic in this category as in the others; however, most of the load to date has occurred during the four year period 1962 to 1965. The number of service employees affected by displacement so far has been in excess of 1800 and is expected to be double that by 1972. Although service firms accounted for one fifth of displacement, they occupied only seven to eight percent of all acquired building space.

Service firms are smaller than the typical displaced firm with the median occupied floor space steady at between 500 and 1000 sq. ft. over time. Eighty-nine percent of all service firms occupied under 3000 sq. ft. versus the 70% value for all firms. The average size of the firm, excluding once again the extremes, fluctuates between 600 and 1900 square feet with a noticeable upward trend. The average space required per employee is steady over time and varies between 100 and 300 sq. ft. per employee.

Service firms are also slightly smaller than is typical as indicated by the median for all firms, for the service median is steady at 2 employees. About three quarters of all service firms employ less than four employees and 86% employ less than eight, somewhat higher than the respective 60% and 80% values for all firms. The average number of employees fluctuates between four and six persons and like the median is also steady over time.

Rentals paid by service firms are the highest of any category and 70% of the firms pay over \$1.00 per square foot per year. Median rents for service firms have been steadily rising and this is undoubtedly due to the strong increase in the numbers of professionals - attorneys, CPA's and others, in this category. The median increased sharply from 1958 to 1961 from \$.25 - .49/sq. ft. to \$1.50 - \$3.00 sq. ft. Since 1965 it has remained in the \$3.00/sq. ft. and over category. Rentals decrease slightly with an increase in the size of the firm. Firms under 6 employees exhibit medians of between \$1.50 and \$300 /sq. ft. and this decreases slightly for firms employing between 6 and 20 persons. For firms with over 20 employees, the median is about \$.75/sq. ft. However, only about five percent of all service firms fall in this category.

One out of every five service firms liquidates on displacement. This fact, however, disguises the more important

point that personal services have a liquidation rate of over 30% or five times thighter than that for professionals and business service firms. The combination of the two into one category is somewhat misleading therefore and some care will be taken not to disguise the differences between the two. In general a fair assumption would seem to be that personal service firms exhibit many of the traits of retail firms and they should probably be thought of in that light. The liquidation rate for all service firms is generally steady at between 21% and 27% through 1964, despite an increasing percentage of professional and business service firms. Actually it appears that after 1962 both subcategories experience an upward shift in liquidation rates that are concealed by a generally steady rate for the entire service category produced as a result of the increase in business service and professional firms; although the latter have a higher liquiddtion rate, it is still low enough to compensate for increases in the personal service subcategory. In 1965 and 1966 the proportion of the firms in the professional and business service subcategory increases to about 80% and the liquidation rates not surprisingly dropped to 8 to 10%. In the first quarter of 1967 the liquidation rate had jumped up to 33% and the ratio for the firms changed to 50:50.⁸

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF SERVICE FIRM DISCONTINUANCES

	Year of Displacement									
Personal Services	<u>58</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>67</u> *
No. of Displacees	18	22	3	7	55	45	27	19	10	6
No. of Liquidations	5	6	3	0	17	16	7	7	1	4
Percentage Liqd.	28	27	100	-	31	36	26	37	10	67
Business Service and Professionals										
No. of Displacees	4	6	2	6	37	20	33	72	37	6
No. of Liquidations	-	-	-	-	2	1	6	1	4	0
Percentage Liqd.	-	-	-	-	5	5	18	1	11	-

* First Quarter only.

Displaced manufacturing firms comprise about 12% of the total relocation load. They accounted for about 18% of the building space and one-quarter of the employees affected by all takings. Approximately one-quarter of the firms were in the printing and allied industries and about 15% were in fabrics, apparel and textiles. Approximately 1.2 million square feet of space have so far been acquired and a sharp increase in these takings is anticipated. The cumulative total should reach about 3.2 million square feet by 1972. Of the 237 firms that have been displaced, over 100 were dislocated in 1962, 43% of the total. By 1967 the total number of employees affected is known to be at least 2,200 and by 1972 the cumulative total is expected to reach over 8,200 persons.

As one would expect in the manufacturing industries, the firms are larger than the average displaced firm. Nearly 45% of the firms are under 3000 sq. ft. as compared to the 70% value for all firms. However, only a small fraction, 7%, occupied building space over 20,000 sq. ft. and therefore even most businesses in this category may be rightly considered as small. The average size of the firm varies between 2,800 and 10,500 sq. ft. if the extreme highs and lows are excluded. The averages are mixed prior to 1962 but since that time they have moved steadily upwards. The median value vacillates between three and ten thousand square feet with lows in 1963 and 1964. About 4 to 600 sq. ft./employee is

typical of the space requirements for the firms and this value is fairly steady over time.

The number of employees per firm runs well above that for the other three categories. The average number of employees per firm increases over time but slightly and is typically at about ten to twelve. Median values are at four to five persons and the trend is definitely larger. Of all manufacturing industries, about one-third have a labor force under 3 persons. Fifty-eight percent of the firms employ less than eight whereas for all firms about 80% employ less than eight persons. To date about four percent of the firms have employed more than fifty persons on displacement.

Rentals increased from median lows of \$.25 - .49/sq. ft. in 1958 to 1960 to values of between \$.50 - .75 by 1961 and have increased only slightly since then. The medians form a fairly tight grouping with the minimum at the \$.25 - .49 category and the maximum median only slightly higher at \$.75 to \$1.00/sq. ft. The median rental by size of firm as measured by the number of employees is quite steady and vacillates at about \$.50 per square foot.

Liquidation rates for manufacturing firms are the lowest for any major category. A maximum value of 11% was reached in 1959 but since that time the rate varies at a lower level between three and ten percent. It is true that the first quarter rate for 1967 is up to 16% but only 6 firms, a very low number, have thus far been displaced. The national

liquidation rate for manufacturing firms is approximately 11% and so the renewal rate for this category not only bears the distinction of being the lowest among the other categories but even falls under the national rate.⁹

In the main, it is apparent that the Boston Redevelopment Authority embarked on an active displacement program between 1958 and 1967 that is to increase in activity and extend to at least 1972. Over six million square feet of floor space have been acquired and over 8000 employees have been affected by the dislocation of 1900 businesses. By 1972 the cumulative totals will have reached about two and a quarter times that with over 14.5 million sq. ft. of floor space acquired and 18,000 employees affected. Thus far the dislocation loads have been erratic with heavy displacement loads occurring in 1962 and 1963 and of all the firms displaced the retail and service establishments comprised the bulk of the load with over 55% of the displacees falling into these two categories.

Dislocation under the renewal program typically means the displacement of small businesses with about three-fifths of the firms occupying under 3000 sq. ft. and/or under four employees. The median size of all firms runs between two and three persons with the manufacturing and wholesaling concerns generally above that value and the retail and service establishments below. The median size of the firms

by both square footage and employees has generally remained constant over time with the exception of the manufacturing industries where increases are evident. The median rentals paid by the displacees increased during the nearly years of the program but have generally held steady since 1960. The rental structure is generally low with about 60% of the firms paying less than \$1.50 per square foot per year and the amount of rent paid tends to vary inversely with size.

The high discontinuance rates typical in most categories of firms suggest that unusual hardships and difficulties are met under conditions of forced displacement. Although the rates have generally been decreasing over time, the rates in those categories with the heaviest displacement loads have tended to increase in the later years. The rates for all firms runs about two to three times higher than the rate for firms under normal market conditions and the rates for the following categories: retailing, services, wholesaling, and manufacturing are respectively thirty-five, twenty-two, seventeen and seven percent. The rate for the entire group over all the years is approximately twenty-two percent; a value that is well below the national urban renewal discontinuance rate of one-third and that tends to vary inversely with the size of the firms.

FOOTNOTES

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIRMS

¹Appendix, p. 47.

²Appendix, p. 48

³John P. Alevizos, An Effective Program for the Relocation of Businesses from Urban Renewal Areas (Boston, 1963), p. 12.

⁴The Failure Record Through 1960 (Dun and Bradstreet, Inc.) pp. 10-13.

⁵Appendix, pp. 49-50.

⁶Appendix, pp. 59-63.

⁷Appendix, pp. 64-68.

⁸Appendix, pp. 74-78.

⁹Appendix, pp. 79-83.

RELOCATION PROCESS

The task of moving a business is a serious affair for men's livelihoods are at stake as well as the risk of general economic loss and the well being of the men's dependents. Thus far we have considered simply the impact of forced dislocation as measured by a total cessation of business activity and it is now appropriate to question the process of relocation itself. In order to facilitate this a survey questionnaire was sent to relocated business men in an attempt to gain their comments and opinions and the data that they had to offer. It has proved useful in the attempt to answer some of the following questions. What kinds of problems and difficulties do different concerns have to meet and conquer? What kinds of decisions have to be made; how well is the firm prepared to make them? What kind of knowledge is available and what techniques can be used to ameliorate the conditions accompanying forced dislocation?

The process of relocating a business requires a great deal of planning and coordination on the part of the owner and often of tasks that he has never before encountered. He must somehow cope with about five major sets of sequential and interrelated problems: (1) The delays, time consumption, uncertainties as to project status, and the income loss that often occurs prior to the property taking; (2) The decision of a contraction or an expansion of the business based on an

evaluation of the changing status of the market and the economic prospects of the firm, the accompanying changes in layout, method of operation, and/or line of products handled; (3) The evaluation of the changing floor space and locational needs of the firm; the locating of suitable space at reasonable rentals; the decision to rent or purchase such space and the ensuing real estate transactions; (4) The planning of the move and the making of the move itself that may include the remodeling, renovation and alteration of the space; the purchase of new equipment and the installation of both new and old equipment; and the staging of the move so as to minimize the "down time" required, the business interruption that means a loss of income, and the establishment of liaison with the redevelopment authority to assure proper and prompt payment for property losses and moving expenses and grants; (5) The adjustments that are required after the move - a period that may require the re-establishment of, or newly formed-business-clientele relationships, the loss of income and receipts, and the retraining of employees.

The period prior to even the project announcement can be filled full of rumors and uncertainty as to which buildings and land parcels will be taken. After the announcement itself and when dislocations begin to occur, a loss of customers and the inability to rent space often causes incomes to decline. About one-third of the survey firms indicated that they had

lost customers and one-quarter reported that they had experienced a loss of income prior to the property taking. In the event that the property has been taken by the renewal authority and that the dislocatee (at this stage a tenant) can show a loss of business, the authority does provide some relief by lowering the rent. Although no specific question was raised in the survey as to loss of private rentals or leasing problems prior to the taking and to relation, it is not an uncommon occurrence. One respondent quite forcefully brought this to the author's attention:

Shortly after the project was announced our tenants lease was out leaving 3 floors (15,000 sq. ft.) vacant for nearly four years. No one would rent space in the whole area...The reimbursement for moving was adequate but was \$15,000 less than we had to spend on the new location. We have been relocated twice (Central Artery, and the Government Center). All our working capital has been depleted by these takings. We feel that the improvement of the area had been made, in part, at the expense of those that were relocated. This is not right.

Some businessmen anticipate the action taken by the renewal authorities and move out prior to the taking of the properties. Even though they forfeit any claim to reimbursements or grants for moving expenses, they apparently believe they benefit by eliminating the risks of a loss of income before the taking. By finding a new location before rentals are forced up by heavy dislocation loads, they are able to find more suitable space in the face of an impending

dwindling supply. It is often argued that such individual initiative simply fulfills the prophecy and hastens the decline of the area and for this reason the practice is strongly discouraged by renewal officials through the policy of withholding monies. The actual economic impact of the "prior-moveouts" would appear to be slight for in Boston only one percent took such action but previous studies indicated that up to 10% of all firms were in this category.¹ In 1958-59, in Boston about 20% of all the firms displaced were either in the prior-moveout category or the status of their move was unknown. Although the number of known prior-moveouts has not declined significantly the total for both unknowns and moveouts has dropped to about four percent.² Some of this can be attributed to the improved accounting and survey procedures that were apparently instituted but some of it is also due to the selectively staged taking areas which helps to minimize the disruption to different business groups. In the survey the relocatees were asked how long it took them to find their present location and about one-fifth indicated that it took no time at all.³ It would seem that the success of the staging policy and the decision to withhold payments has had some effect but the businessmen have apparently retained their concern about being able to find adequate space and the right location. One respondent replied that he had obtained space long before

he was required to move (and was undoubtedly paying double rents) and explained that he had wised up early and knew that he needed "insurance".

A somewhat traumatic experience must gradually unfold as the business man begins to learn that he must dislocate and relocate his business. The variety and the complexity of the decisions are numerous; the chances of error are great and the consequences can be disastrous. The notes written by some of the survey respondents could not but convey this impression:

The property was taken March 1, 1966, and fortunately we did not run scared so that we are still in business. This is our second forced move and we now pay rent to the BRA. We have been doing business as usual, but we are hanging by a thread, not knowing when the axe will fall. Relocating for our type of business is very difficult, so where it took us 20 years to get where we are, it will probably take the BRA 30 days to knock us out of business and out of our livelihood.

Another respondent put it much more simply, "It's just tough for those who happen to be involved in relocation!"

The act of simply picking up a business and plunking it down in a new location, even if it could be done as simply as that, means that in many cases it must be redefined as "new", and as is known, the liquidation rate for new businesses is indeed high. A new location means a change in clientele and quite possibly a change in suppliers and distributors. It can also mean a change in the type of products

handled and the method of displaying and selling them. Decisions must therefore be made before one starts looking for a new piece of real estate. The owner must try and decide what kinds of shifts in the market have taken or will take place that might be to his advantage or disadvantage and then he must decide how he might best capitalize of these facts. The most critically affected are of course the retail merchants who often have smaller trading areas and are dependent on a closer personal and time-physical relationship with their customers. About 50% of the retail merchants indicated that they had lost customers due to relocation as compared to one-fifth to one-third for the other types of businesses.⁴ The heavy shifts possible through the relocation and renewal process therefore make this part of relocation most difficult for them. One survey respondent, in explaining the financial loss she had assumed, quite candidly put it like this:

We lost about \$30,000 because the removal of people and our business did not move in the same direction. My late husband had given credit to all the people in the Washington Park area. They scattered all over the area - leaving no forwarding addresses. About 10% were honest - and notified us of their new addresses.

Dependent on the type of market and the economic prospects of an individual business, the decisions must be made as to whether it might be advantageous to expand or contract, drop or add product or product lines and/or services.

Some of the firms have found relocation to be a blessing in disguise. The wholesale trade and manufacturing industries in particular are often able to realize real benefits for the move gives them a chance to reorganize the layout of the production or shipping processes, substitute new machinery for old, change to more efficient one level working spaces that allow for a smooth flow of goods and to generally improve the working space and conditions of the concern. Even retail firms are often able to take the opportunity to change their operating methods. About one-fifth of all the survey firms changed their method of operation and/or dropped or added products, product lines or services. Over 40% of the wholesale firms changed their method of operation and almost 40% of the retail firms underwent changes in products or services. How much of the changes in the retail trade area could be considered beneficial as versus an adjustment is not known, but it is apparent that a considerable shaking up process occurs.⁵ The degree of change is also evident in the percentage change of the amount of floor space that is occupied by the survey firms after displacement from the amount they occupied previously. Although the median for all the survey firms indicated about a five to nine percent increase only about five percent of the firms fell within this category. Of the ten levels of change ranging from a negative fifty percent and over, to a positive fifty percent and over, the

greatest number of firms were to be found at the extreme values. Approximately one-quarter of the respondents had indicated a decrease in size of over 25% and between one-third and one-half increased in size over 25%.⁶

There is a variety of problems associated with the finding and acquisition of building space and location; the degrees of suitability of these two items are also in themselves important. Of all the major problems encountered these two were among the highest for about one-third of all the businesses that responded to the survey indicated that one and/or the other had caused them difficulty. About one-half of the wholesale trade and manufacturing industries reported that they had difficulty in finding suitable space whereas the values for the other categories ranged from one-quarter to one-third. A check by size of firm suggests that the smaller firms have less trouble than the larger for the percentage values increase as the size of the firm increases. An increase in values with an increase in size also occurs when we consider the problem of the location, but not to the same degree. It would appear that the large numbers of small service firms among the respondents conceals some of the problems of the small retail merchant for about two-fifths of all retail firms have trouble finding a location whereas only one-quarter to one-third of the businesses employing less than three persons made this denotation.

Wholesale firms found the most difficulty in finding suitable locations as about one-half indicated that they had had problems and of the others not yet mentioned the values ranged from one-quarter to a third.

The most frequently checked problem area was that of unreasonable or high rents. About $\frac{1}{2}$ of all the firms checked this category and about three-fifths of the retail respondents indicated that they had encountered this difficulty. There is no significant deviation by size of firm but it is interesting to note that the firms under four employees felt that this was their most important problem for about $\frac{1}{2}$ checked it whereas the problem of a suitable location came in a poor second with between one-quarter and a third. The fact the relocatees encountered high rents in their search for new locations does not of course confirm that they paid them. It was not too difficult to check the increases that they finally paid. A comparison of the new rents with the former revealed that about two-thirds of the 106 respondents for which information was available had sustained increases in excess of twenty-five percent. The rent for about two-fifths increased by over fifty percent.

Other minor problems were denoted by some of the firms. Among these were licensing and zoning restrictions that affected about $\frac{1}{10}$ of the retail firms. The services and retail trade tended to be concerned that they did not receive enough time to find a decent location. Approximately one-fifth

of the wholesale and retail trade concerns indicated that they had faced financing problems and less than one-tenth of the firms complained of any leasing problems.⁷

Most of the different types of businesses felt that they had serious problems in one area or another. In wholesale and retail trade were registered the most complaints for a wide variety of problems and the fewest were encountered among the services. This is undoubtedly due to the high percentage of professional and business service firms answering the questionnaire. It will be recalled that the percentage of these firms in the services category has been on the increase and since the survey returns are skewed, as one would expect, toward the later years, then this would seemingly account for many of the high number of responses in this category. These firms apparently do not have the relocation problems that are typical of so many of the others. The case becomes quite evident through the words of one CPA:

I have partially completed the form, (the questionnaire) but, as accountants, the relocation really was of minor consequence to us, other than the inconvenience of time lost preparing to move and moving. The relocation agency paid the cost of the mover, and beyond this we had very little to do with them.

Businessmen typically use about five major ways to actually find a new location and foremost among these is the simple method of finding a location by oneself - presumably

by getting in a car and driving around or checking out newspaper listings. About one-half of the relocatees used this method which they sometimes combined with some other means such as asking friends or working through other business men. Realtors apparently helped about one-quarter of them and the relocation agency was given credit for less than five percent. Some businessmen, when they were requested to check the means they had used to find a new location, simply penciled in the words "worthless" and "no help" after the spot entitled "relocation agency" while others noted that the relocation space they were shown was inadequate for their business and at rentals they could ill afford.⁸

Some of the answers given in the survey, a few of which have already been quoted, indicate that not all of the decisions facing the businessmen were met objectively or even considered important. Certainly preconceptions exist among the business community as to the effects renewal is going to have on a particular area and, often acting in the face of uncertainty, they buy or purchase space and make decisions on the basis of inadequate information and technical assistance. Clearly some of them develop an emotional attitude that, however understandable, still serves to impair their judgement. Many felt that landlords were going to up their rental prices and the supply of building space would dwindle and thus, in many instances, many came to hasty decisions. Professor Zimmer,

through in-depth interviews, attempted to check the amount of information available to the dislocatees and on what basis, or lack of it, the decisions had actually been made.⁹ Probably the most significant findings were that a high portion acted without knowledge of the previous history of the site, of the former occupant, of the vacancy length, etc., and that many had acted in concern over rentals and building space and were therefore unable or did not study and look for other alternatives. Zimmer found that a considerable minority had but limited knowledge of the previous occupancy; that about 2/5 did not know of the length of vacancy; one in every four did not know why the previous occupant moved and that about 1/5 simply knew that the previous occupant went out of business. In addition many had failed to attempt to evaluate the market conditions at the new location or estimate the potential volume of business that might be generated at the new location. About three-quarters to one-half of all the businesses fell into the previous categories and about two-thirds of all the businesses generally failed to give adequate or any consideration to the merits of alternate locations.¹⁰

The planning of the move and the making of the move itself may include the remodeling, renovation and alteration of the acquired space, the purchase of new equipment and the installation of both new and old equipment, and the staging

of the move so as to minimize the amount of business interruption. It is at this time that the business concern finds that it must establish a liaison with the renewal authority to determine just what may and may not be compensated and to assure proper and prompt payment for property losses and moving expenses and grants. The period is fraught with a lack of communication and a certain amount of misunderstanding between the firms and the relocation officials. The businessmen feel that they should be adequately compensated for the move and attempt to take full advantage of the law. On the other hand the renewal authority can only compensate for expenses that are allowed under the law.

It must be obvious that a period of adjustment occurs after the move has been completed. A great many decisions for change would already have been made and carried out by the time the business opens at its new location. The effects of the move, the character of the new location, the impact of the change in employees and sales, is further discussed in the chapters that deal with the question of the impact of the changes on the city and on the firms. However, most of the information deals with the direct consequences of the move and not the transition period that follows; indeed, not a great deal of information is available, at this time. One basic assumption has been carried through the thesis to the effect that the majority of the harmful and beneficial

consequences due to forced dislocation will become evident near the period of highest stress - the move itself. The assumption would appear to be a valid one and thus the lack of information on this period is not too critical.

There are, however, two points that should be stressed. The first is that the first two years after displacement are probably the most difficult, for the businesses starting at new locations and under a changed set of circumstances must really be considered as new business ventures. The liquidation rates are high for young businesses and though the author had no way of checking on the magnitude of liquidations, about five percent of the respondents of the survey, which covered all the years, either liquidated or were in bankruptcy proceedings. Furthermore, about 18% could not be reached through the mail, although admittedly the percentages were surprisingly low for the first few years.¹¹ Kinnaird found, during studies in depth in New Haven, that about 15% of the firms completing the move actually liquidated due to reasons associated with the relocation process - how typical that data may be is unknown.¹²

The second point to be emphasized concerns the adjustment to the carry-over effects that presumably result from the high degree of change. The importance of this is evident when we examine the number of firms gaining or losing employees on displacement - one area in which some data is available. Information was sufficient for only about 161

respondents or about two-thirds of the total. Of these only one-quarter neither lost nor gained employees, but of course this does not indicate there was a lack of employee turnover necessitating adjustment and employee training. However, approximately one-third lost employees and two-fifths gained employees and thus an undeniably large portion experienced some sort of change. The smaller firms, as a category, apparently took more losses than the larger firms with about three-fifths so indicating. The overall effect appears to be about zero however, for the size of the losses among these firms losing employees appears to compensate for the number of firms gaining.¹³

In conclusion, we have found the process of relocating a business involves many problems that the businessman cannot control, introduces problems that he is unable to or has not anticipated, and that require decision making beyond his experience and information beyond his reach. Among these are the following:

1. The loss of sales, customers and income prior to the move that effects between one-third and a quarter of the relocatees.
2. A high degree of emotional and economic involvement in the business, and therefore in the relocation process - an involvement that can hinder rational decision making.
3. An unfamiliarity with real estate transactions,

negotiations, and financing procedures coupled with a natural reluctance to hire high-priced attorneys.

4. Licensing and zoning problems.

5. The inability to control the time of the move, a problem that creates uncertainty and hinders re-location planning.

6. The lack of sufficient time, knowledge and information to consider alternatives as to location, type and size of building space, and financing and staging.

7. The age and stamina of the owner.

8. The adjustment period after the move that requires adequate interim financing, the re-establishment of good will - the clientele relationship, and the retraining of employees.

FOOTNOTES

RELOCATION PROCESS

¹W. N. Kinnard and Z. S. Malinowski, The Impact of Dislocation from Urban Renewal Areas on Small Business (Connecticut, 1960), pp. 39-40.

²Appendix, p. 51.

³Appendix, p. 92.

⁴Appendix, p. 100-102.

⁵Appendix, p. 105.

⁶Appendix, p. 106.

⁷Appendix, pp. 94-99.

⁸Appendix, p. 93 and Basil Zimmer, Rebuilding Cities - The Effects of Displacement and Relocation on Small Business. (Chicago, 1964), pp. 97-98.

⁹Zimmer, p. 104.

¹⁰Zimmer, pp. 109-110.

¹¹Appendix, pp. 34-35.

¹²W. N. Kinnard, Statement to the Select Committee on Real Property Acquisition (Connecticut, 1964), pp. 9-10.

¹³Appendix, pp. 108-110.

IMPACT ON THE FIRMS

The previous chapter outlines some of the problems and difficulties encountered by the firms during the relocation process. This general line of discussion is carried further here by examining a few of the consequences of forced displacement. First we shall take into consideration the high liquidation rate. Some of the questions that have been raised are these: Why are the liquidation rates so high and of all the government programs why is the rate in renewal areas the highest? Are many of the firms marginal or sub-marginal in character and consequently take advantage of cheap rentals and spring up and die overnight? If so, is there a negligible loss of jobs? Second, we shall see whether the relocatees were able to improve the conditions under which they were doing business. Might the relocated firms actually be able to improve and upgrade themselves under a forced displacement situation?

The rate of discontinuances of firms is of prime importance for it gives some measure as to the detrimental effects of forced displacement. A certain number of discontinuances is also to be expected for it is a reflection of the risks of doing business. Rate statistics for firms operating under normal market conditions throughout the nation have been available for some time and as may be expected the rates vary by type of firm, size of firm and number of years in business. The percentage discontinuances and failures ranges from a low of

approximately six percent for service firms to a high (for the four previously specified categories) of eleven percent for manufacturing firms. The rate varies inversely with the size of the firm and the number of years in business.¹

Over fifty-eight percent of all failures occur in the first five years after the establishment of the business and firms in business over ten years account for only about twenty percent.² As we have seen, the liquidation rate for all displaced firms in Boston is about twenty-two percent - a value over three times as high as the "normal" for the all firms category. The rate for wholesale firms was about two-and-one-half times normal and the retail rate over four times the norm. The service category split and for personal service establishments had a high rate of about five to six times the norm whereas professionals and business service firms discontinued at a rate of only eight percent versus the norm of six. The seven percent rate for manufacturing firms was below the norm of eleven percent. The high rate of discontinuances for all firms and the variations by category take us to the heart of the controversial issues surrounding forced non-residential dislocations.

It might be well to pause for a moment and ask whether the liquidation rates that have just been mentioned for Boston are atypical. They would appear to be and they are on the low side. Displacements from urban renewal areas throughout the country have taken place at over 7000 firms per year. The

rate of discontinuance has been thirty-five percent; thus the Boston rate, for renewal projects, has been about 65% of the national figure. Although the rate of discontinuances is the highest in the renewal program of all federally assisted projects, the rates for the highway program, low rent housing, General Services Administration and US Army Engineers varies between 21 and 26 percent. For all federal and federally assisted programs, about 10,900 displacements have occurred per year accompanied by over 3,300 discontinuances at a combined rate of 31.1 percent.³

Many reasons for the high number of liquidations undoubtedly exist and most probably a single liquidation is indeed a combination of several factors. Some over simplification has undoubtedly occurred in attempts to quantify the reasons but if the studies which do this are viewed as listing the main causes they do give some insight to the problem. A URA study in the late summer of 1964 quantified the reasons for liquidation for 198 businesses displaced from renewal projects; this represented a discontinuance rate of 32%. The report listed retirement as the main reason as $\frac{1}{4}$ of the liquidations fell into this classification. Approximately $\frac{1}{5}$ of the owners were reported to be devoting time to other business interests and 28% were either not interested in relocating and wanted to dispose of their business or were unable to find a suitable location. A variety of other reasons were listed including some kind of legal action as bankruptcy

or tax liens, employment in another business, operations ceased prior to acquisition, deceased, branch of chain operation (liquidation statistical) and still others planned to re-establish at a later date. The last is a position often taken by taverns or businesses operating with a liquor license who hold the license for future use, or businesses who are in an interim period and trying to swing a deal or financing, etc. An unknown category typically includes those businesses that could not be contacted or simply disappeared because they were illegal. It is interesting that a category entitled "due to displacement" or "unknown" - to cover a myriad of other reasons, were not listed. It is also fairly obvious that the classifications are not mutually exclusive. The BRA uses a less complicated listing and a summary appendix table (page 51) enumerates the reasons. The listings have only been maintained from 1961 and so if the data for the West End project is excluded, then about 40% of the liquidations are attributed to retirement. Values ranging from twelve to fifteen percent of the total indicate that liquor licenses, plans to re-establish and the unavailability of space account for most of the remainder. The percentage attributed to retirement varies from a high of 64% for wholesale firms and lows of 30-31% for retail and manufacturing firms. It is interesting to note that only about one percent of the liquidations have been attributed to the classification "Due to Displacement."

The problem of the elderly business man appears to be a very real one. Some peripheral information tends to reinforce this conclusion. First, about $\frac{1}{4}$ of all businesses under four employees liquidates versus the usual $\frac{1}{5}$. Secondly, the survey of relocated firms indicated that over 60% of the respondents had been in business over twenty years.⁵ It seems unlikely that statistics for the liquidated firms, if available, would show a decrease of the amount of time in business over $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{2}{3}$ and thus this suggests that the liquidated businesses had been in operation for some time. It seems a fair conclusion, from information as to the size of the firms and time in operation, that a significant proportion of the liquidating firms are operated by the elderly of which a high proportion are probably proprietors. There is, however, no indication that these businesses might not have continued on indefinitely if they were not forced to dislocate and the owners required to go through a difficult and strenuous relocation procedure that is endowed with a high measure of risk and loss of capital. One survey respondent put it quite bluntly, "I was forced to semi-retire". It can be a very difficult time for the elderly business man; he loses not only a livelihood but also a sense of responsibility and access to useful and meaningful work. The problem is not even confined solely to the businessman. One priest (Ukrainian Orthodox) wrote that his apartment was broken into and extensive damage done

as a part of the neighborhood deterioration after "renewal" started. A social worker who had helped him fill out the questionnaire enclosed the following comments:

"Herewith enclosed is the questionnaire from.....Mission, Which I helped its priest fill out. (I am a social worker he met many years ago when he was helping to re-settle displaced persons). His move forced him to close.....Mission entirely. He might have had to reduce activities in any event because he is now close to 80 years of age. But not reflected in the questionnaire, perhaps, is the fact he lost a much-used little recreation room for teenagers and his entire little congregation was dispersed."

The high discontinuance rate for renewal projects has often brought the suggestions and conclusions that many of the businesses to be found in renewal areas were sub-marginal or marginal in character. The very fact that the areas are specifically selected on the basis of poor environmental conditions, in contrast to perhaps the highway program, undoubtedly accounts for some of the difference in the rates. It has been extremely difficult to document the proportion of the marginal business in the relocation load for ideally this would mean developing a picture of each firm through an analysis of income and loss statements. Most studies have attempted to draw conclusions from the exterior appearances of the conditions of the establishments - the physical condition, the rent structure (i.e., overhead), size and type of business, and the turnover rate.

A Baltimore report published in 1958 was among the first

to conclude that:

Establishments requiring little skill, experience or capital investment will spring up almost overnight in an area with a high vacancy rate of commercial facilities.⁶

A URA report came to much the same conclusion after finding that service and retail trade establishments made up 87% of the displacement load of 173 businesses in its analysis and that hotels and rooming houses accounted for 48+% of all discontinued services. Retail drinking and eating establishments comprised 48+% of all discontinued retail trade and that together the classifications: eating, drinking and rooming houses, constituted over 40% of all liquidations. The report continued as follows:

In conclusion, and as alluded to at the hearings on June 7, a substantial but unknown proportion of the small business displaced from urban renewal clearance project areas are marginal or even submarginal in nature. Such businesses can only exist in areas where overhead costs or rents are low if they are to operate at all. Therefore, for example, when businessmen of this nature attribute their failure to relocate to their inability to find a "suitable" new location, it may well be that satisfactory new locations do, in fact, exist but the marginal or submarginal businessman cannot afford to assume normal overhead costs or pay normal rents. For them as individuals their displacement may be tragic, indeed, and good public policy requires that they be assisted as much as possible. This is URA policy. At the same time their situation should not obscure the fact that approximately two-thirds of the displaced businesses do successfully relocate.⁷

The question arises as to how typical the URA study is and how valid the conclusions are. Would this in turn mean that the losses through discontinuances are insignificant?

When compared to the 1900 displaced businesses in Boston, it would appear that the study area used by the URA was atypical in that it had a high proportion of hotels and rooming houses. In Boston, the service and retail trade establishments made up only 55% of the load and of retail trade, the eating and drinking establishments did account for a high, forty-two percent of the discontinuances. Together the taverns, restaurants and rooming houses comprised 27% of the total liquidations.⁸ These businesses bring some peculiar problems to the discussion. The restaurants and taverns generally must have liquor licenses and thus relocation is often dependent upon those licenses. At the present time it is felt that Boston has issued far more licenses than it needs; it is a situation that is left over from the war. It is now current policy to purchase liquor licenses back from the owners at about \$10,000. It is also the policy of the Small Business Administration not to make loans for these businesses. If we examine the reasons for liquidating retail businesses it may be seen that about 23% of the liquidations are due to liquor licenses - a condition that is responsible for over 40% of the liquidations among the eating and drinking establishments.⁹ Some of these

businesses probably do manage to re-establish and 17% of the discontinuances in retail trade are assigned this classification. It is doubtful however that a significant proportion ever succeed in actually re-establishing. Some discussion has already occurred in regards the problem of rooming houses and in Boston an insignificant number of hotels were encountered. Suffice it to say that the problem is largely one of real estate and dwelling units. Many rooming houses are run in converted large homes which are generally of some age and probably in a state of disrepair. The only really feasible way of "relocating" is then the purchase of another existing building. The relocation of this residential real estate business, the managing of a property, is dependent upon the owners ability to find a new structure that can be profitably bought or leased or rented; it is a situation quite different from the usual relocation task. If any real loss accrues to the public sector it is probably through the loss of the dwelling units which may or may not have been substandard.

The URA report inferred that because of the type of business it was therefore marginal in nature but as we have seen a significant proportion of restaurants, taverns and rooming houses encounter problems unique to the type of business. The question as to how marginal these or other businesses are or in what proportion to the total load they may be, remains unanswered. In an attempt to shed

at least some light on the characteristics of the liquidated business we shall take a closer look at them by size and rentals.

The size of a firm gives some measure as to the amount of capital invested in the business venture and therefore some measure of the size of the risk involved. Many of the firms too, have probably started out as proprietorships and although the data for Boston was not available for this variable, other studies indicate that a high percentage of displaced businesses are proprietorships and partnerships. The size of the firm also suggests that a direct relationship probably exists with the amount of time in business as most concerns attempt to expand and grow over time. As has been previously stated the liquidation rate normally tends to vary inversely with the size of the business and with the time in business.

The discontinuance rate for renewal firms does vary inversely with the size of the business; however, a significant downward shift in the rate does not occur until a large proportion of the businesses have been included.¹⁰ About 25% of all businesses in the under four persons classifications liquidate and 20% of those businesses in the four to eight persons categories liquidate. If we realize that about 80% of all displaced business falls within this classification then we must concede that the rate is quite uniformly high.

Significant variations occur by the type of business. The rates for wholesale firms decline distinctly with an increase in size and the rate for one-person-firms is one third; that for two to three persons is one-quarter; that for four to five persons is one-fifth and that for six to seven persons is one-eighth. The pattern for retail firms is quite different for not until the firms are very large, by renewal standards, does the rate drop below 16%. Over one-third of the retail establishments under three persons and somewhat less than one-third of those in the four to five person category liquidate. The rate then increases to over 40% for those firms employing six to seven persons and then drops to 23% for firms with eight to twenty employees. The rates in the service classification follow the same general pattern as that for retail trade-only at a reduced level. A higher number of the one-person-firms discontinue than any other and then the rate is fairly uniform until the firms are over approximately eight employees but by that time 86% of the firms have been covered. The manufacturing discontinuance rates are quite uniform at between 5% and 8% until the firms employ over 20 persons. The highest liquidation rate of 11% concurs with two to three person firms. It seems fair to conclude that, with the exception of the wholesale businesses which comprise but 1/10 of the total displacement load, for the purposes of the argument, the vast majority of the businesses, by type of business, liquidate

surprisingly uniformly according to distribution by size.¹¹

The rentals that a business pays should in some measure reflect the amount of overhead that the business is able to carry and therefore it presumably is an indicator, though admittedly crude, of the marginality of the firm. There are generally few "prime" rentals paid by businesses in renewal areas as has already been made clear and therefore the usual assumption is made that the businesses desire low rentals and the conclusion thus follows that this is supporting evidence that a high proportion of the liquidations can be imputed to the marginal establishment.

It has already been conceded that the rental structure in renewal areas is generally low and in Boston about one-half of the displaced firms paid less than \$1.00 per square foot per year, but the real test would be as to whether those paying the lower rental rates discontinued more often than the business concerns paying higher rates. We shall therefore examine the case for the entire dislocation load and then break this down by type of business so as to ascertain what variations may occur.

The rental structures for all firms and by type of firm have been displayed on tables according to nine classification levels. One level provides a receptacle for unknowns and two others for those very low rentals below \$.25/sq. ft. Approximately 90% of the business concerns fall quite uniformly

into the other six categories. With the exception of those firms paying rentals below \$.12/sq. ft., very little variation in the liquidation rate is apparent. With the exception of the highest category of over \$3.00/sq. ft., where the rate drops to 17%, the discontinuance rates for all the other categories vary between 18 and 24% with no apparent reduction in the rate corresponding with an increase in the amount paid per square foot.¹²

Approximately sixteen percent of all wholesale firms discontinue operations on dislocation. About 60% of all the firms fall in the rental levels between \$.25 and \$1.00 but the liquidation rate for these firms varies between five and eleven percent, values that are well below the norm. There is some indication that higher discontinuance rates occur at both extremes of the scale for the highest values occur there. Most notable however, is the fact the two highest rental rates correspond with the two highest discontinuance rates of twenty-five and eighteen percent.

The correlation between rental levels and discontinuance rates for retail trade are even more interesting. The rates vary from twenty-seven to thirty-seven percent for the seven highest rental levels and increase, generally, with the rental level; a condition occurs therefore that is directly opposite to the one that was expected.

The pattern of relationships between rates and rentals of service firms is similar to the one already described for

wholesale firms with the extreme variations at the ends of the rental scale. The rates are fairly uniform over the major portion of the scale and vary between eighteen and twenty-five percent but for those concerns paying over \$3.00, about 38% of all service firms, the rate instead of swinging up sharply, drops to a low of eight percent.

Manufacturing industries have a rental structure skewed to the lower values and quite different from the patterns established by the other types of businesses with the possible exception of wholesale trade. The highest liquidation rate of fourteen-percent is associated with rents of \$.12-.25/sq.ft. and by volume accounts for 11 percent of the manufacturing firms. Three quarters of the concerns are in the four levels directly above that and the discontinuance rates fluctuate from four to nine percent. There is a tendency for the rates to drop with an increase in rental level but the volume of liquidations is so small, sixteen in total, as to make conjecture on this point quite arbitrary.¹³

The charge that high turnover rates is typical for businesses in renewal areas is apparently an unfounded one. The very high length of time in business that was already mentioned for relocated firms tends to contradict the high turnover theory. Eighty-nine percent or more of all the survey, relocated firms by the four major business categories, indicated that they had been in business over eight years and with the exception of the service category of which only 40%

had been in business over twenty years, over two-thirds of the remainder had been in business for that period of time.¹⁴ It is difficult to believe that a significant portion of the discontinued firms had been in business less than five years. Data published by Dun and Bradstreet shows that 58% of the liquidations for all firms under normal circumstances happen when the concerns are of five years of age or less and that only one-fifth of the closings occur among firms in business over ten years. Variations by type of business are not too significant for the minimum for the five year rates is about fifty percent for wholesale firms and the maximum of sixty-five percent is for retail trade. These mortality studies indicate that there was a high probability that those firms over five years of age, and this apparently includes the bulk of dislocated firms, could have carried on indefinitely.

The conclusion above is confirmed by other studies. The Zimmer report indicated that the typical firm in his report was over five years old and the study was done in depth for about 300 businesses. An additional study undertaken in Hartford under the direction of W. N. Kinnard revealed that, in a group of firms not dislocated, of all the firms that ceased to operate, about three-quarters were less than five years old. The median age of the closings for the smaller firms was reported to be 2.9 years and for all firms the median was 3.2 years. For those business concerns that had

been in business over five years, the liquidation rate dropped to under twenty percent. The high 75% value differs from the Dun & Bradstreet figure and might be accounted for by the smallness of the firms but the conclusions that would be drawn from the figures is not changed.¹⁵

In an effort to gain some information on the environmental conditions into which the relocatees moved and their general reactions to business conditions at their new site, the survey questionnaire made the request that they compare their new and old locations.¹⁶ Six categories for comparison were listed: general business, costs, parking, access, merchandise handling, and working space and layout. Most of the survey firms responded to the request and although some did not complete the form entirely, about a 94% response of a total possible preference listing of 1428 was obtained. As might be expected from the information already presented about the different types of firms, the retail firms were the most disgruntled, the service firms complacent and the manufacturing and wholesale industries reacted quite favorably.

The response for all the groups taken together was quite favorable for about one-quarter of the responses indicated that conditions had remained the same and nearly fifty percent noted that they had improved. The ratio of the responses that indicated that the new location was better in comparison to the old was positive and over 1.7:1 for every category except

that of costs where it was negative at 1:3.2. The greatest satisfaction was noted for improvements in methods of handling merchandise and improvements in working space and layout where the respective ratios were 3.5:1 and 4.3:1.

About 22% of the replies given by retail firms indicated conditions had remained unchanged and the ratio of new to old for all categories was 1:1.2. Much of the negative attitude is explained by a heavy aversion to cost increases where the ratio of new to old was 1:14. The merchants felt that general business was off slightly and that parking and access had not measurably improved. The businessmen who felt that they had been able to improve merchandise handling over those who thought it was better at their old location was at about 1.8:1 and for working space and layout the ratio was 1.3:1.

The service firms were much more neutral to relocation and about 40% apparently experienced little change. The ratio of new to old for all categories was 1 to 1. They had negative reactions to the two categories, parking and access, besides that of costs, but generally felt that business had improved as had their working space and layout.

Wholesale firms were able to greatly improve conditions through the move, for about two-thirds of the responses favored the new location and only about 16% were neutral. About four-fifths of the respondents felt that general business had improved or was the same and the ratio of those favoring

the new to the old was 3:1. Only in the cost category were the replies in favor of the old location, by a ratio of about 1:2, and all other categories had ratios equal to or greater than 7:1.

Although manufacturing industries were not as in favor of their new locations as the wholesalers, about 50% of the replies favored the new location, about 30% indicated it was at least as good, and the overall ratio of the responses, new to old, was 2.1:1. Once again the cost category was the only condition that was more favorable at the old site with a ratio of 1:2.8, and apparently the parking had not greatly improved. General business was regarded as having improved as nearly nine-tenths reported it was at least the same or better and the ratio of new to old was 2.8:1. The three other categories exhibited ratios above 3.8:1.

In conclusion, we find that the discontinuance rate is one measure of the detrimental impact of forced displacement on the dislocatees. It is a measure of the conclusion of business activity, but remains quite inadequate in rendering an accurate picture of the degree of impairment to those continuing operations. Even so, it does not seem unreasonable to conclude that where circumstances occurred that cause abnormally high liquidation rates, then some detrimental effects must have been felt by those that re-located. Abnormally high discontinuance rates occur among

nearly all business types and sizes of firms with the percentage of the liquidations varying inversely with the size of the firm and with the retail and personal service establishments experiencing a proportionately greater number of liquidations.

The time in business recorded by most survey firms coupled with the reasons for liquidation compiled by the redevelopment authority support the findings of other studies that a difficult problem exists in the displacement of firms operated by elderly businessmen. Particular problems arise in financing the move and in the physical and emotional stamina required to make the move due to the age of the displacee.

It would appear that although a portion of the dislocated firms and the liquidate firms are undoubtedly marginal in character, the majority are not. Many of the liquidated firms pay average and above average rents for displacees and their numbers are not confined to lower size categories. In addition, the high liquidation rates cannot be associated with fly-by-night operations and the high liquidation rates normally typical of new businesses for it would appear that many, if not most of the relocated firms and in all probability the liquidated firms, have been in business a considerable length of time. One is therefore led to the conclusion that the high rate of discontinuances is due to the fact that the businesses are forcibly displaced. Thus

attempts to dismiss the losses as "normal", due to the supposition of a high number of marginal businesses and high turnover rates, cannot be accepted.

The firms that were successful in relocating were generally able to improve the physical conditions under which they operate. General business, the working space and layout of activities, and the methods of handling merchandise were generally seen to improve. Improvements in parking conditions and access to the business were also noted; conditions that besides suggesting an improvement in individual distribution practices, also imply a lessening of congestion and crowding in the city. Most firms noted an increase in costs that accompanied the move. Many of the retail firms were disgruntled and expressed low levels of improvement and the service firms were generally complacent. Wholesalers and manufacturing firms registered particularly favorable comments.

If the above conclusions may be considered valid, then the implications of the findings are both negative and positive. They are negative because the losses to the firms, the owners and employees, and the city must be of real concern and considered important, and that the present relocation program cannot be considered successful until the losses are further reduced. On the positive side, the data suggests that the majority of the firms have considerable vitality, much more than previously thought, and this suggests that aid, counselling services and technical assistance, if properly

applied, could have a considerable impact.

FOOTNOTES

IMPACT ON THE FIRMS

¹ Betty Churchill, "Recent Business Population Movements," Survey of Current Business, (January, 1954) pp. 11-16.

² The Failure Record, pp. 10-13.

³ Study of Compensation and Assistance, p. 30.

⁴ Hearings Before the Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee on Small Business (Washington, 1965), pp. 41-42.

⁵ Appendix, p. 91.

⁶ The Displacement of Small Business from a Slum Clearance Area (Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency, 1958), p. 3.

⁷ Hearings, p. 43.

⁸ Appendix, p. 1.

⁹ Appendix, p. 68.

¹⁰ Appendix, p. 45.

¹¹ Appendix, pp. 60, 65, 70, 75, 80 and 85.

¹² Appendix, pp. 46.

¹³ Appendix, pp. 62, 67, 72, 77, 82, and 87.

¹⁴ Appendix, p. 91.

¹⁵ W. N. Kinnard, Statement, pp. 3-5.

¹⁶ Appendix, pp. 117-123.

CHAPTER VI

IMPACT ON THE CITY

The discussion that follows serves as a necessary complement to the discussion of the problems and difficulties encountered by the individual firms and the resulting consequences of forced dislocation. Business dislocation has generally been considered a "side-effect" of the renewal program and quite often reduced to the status of an impediment to getting the "real" job done. Most of the dislocation load is simply determined on a project ad hoc basis that allows the project to move forward. It can also take the form of a submission to the local community action groups who work outside the area and are thus more vocal about housing needs than employment. After all more land for housing and services has to be created somehow. It therefore becomes pertinent to question the importance of the impact of the dislocations on the socio-economic fabric of the city. Is the magnitude of displacement sufficiently large to cause concern? What is the economic impact - have the dislocations contributed to or accelerated the general decline and loss of employment in the city? Conversely, has the decline affected ease of dislocation and relocation?

The redevelopment authority estimates that about four percent of city employment, excluding government workers, will be affected by dislocation within the next five years. Different values of course reflect the impact on different

employment sectors especially since the city is heavy in the service areas and a relatively small amount, 1.8% of displacement is to occur there. The manufacturing sector is to be the harest hit for about 8% of all industrial jobs are to be directly affected. About four and one-half percent of wholesale and retail trade jobs will be affected.¹ These figures conceal the cumulative magnitude of displacement and if the above estimates are correct then over 10% of all manufacturing jobs in the city will have been moved between the years 1958 and 1972. Nearly 5000 retail jobs or over 11% of all retail employment will have been displaced by that time and 5.7% and 6.9% respectively, of all wholesale and service jobs can also be included.²

From the analysis of the relocation load taken under consideration earlier, it was apparent that the typical dislocated firm was smaller than the norm. Therefore, as one would expect, the dislocated firms must really be placed in a subcategory by size among all firms, and thus as a group they form subcategories within the six major business type classifications to which we have previously referred. However, even as percentages of the group totals, the numbers of displaced firms are impressive. By 1972 nearly one-quarter, 24.2% of all the manufacturing firms and slightly over one-quarter 25.3% of all the retail establishments

within the city will have been displaced. Approximately 15% of the wholesale firms and of the services will also have been affected.³

That the firms truly belong in subcategories, even as a group, can be readily realized from the following excerpt from a Boston Redevelopment Authority report. The report examined the impact of dislocation on a 15 census tract study area which, by the 1960 census, had at least a 50% non-white population. The distinguishing characteristic in this case, beyond a minority racial issue, is the apparently high number of low skilled jobs that are provided by the firms yet to be displaced - a fact quite consistent with the low rental structure mentioned previously.

Boston Redevelopment Authority records indicate that during the period of 1966 through 1972, 13.5% of all the manufacturing firms in the city will face relocation due to some form of public action. Among the types of firms most heavily affected will be apparel (22.3% of all of these firms in the city), and textile (17.3% of all of these firms in the city) and leather (18.9% of all of these firms in the city). These three manufacturing operations employ about 35% of all the residents of the 15 tracts employed in manufacturing, or about 10% of the total labor force of the area.⁴

The full treatment of the consequences of displacement by such subcategories is beyond the scope of this thesis, but the above report does suggest a fruitful area

for the study of the impact on minority groups, employment losses and retraining programs, changes in work place - residence relationships, and the journey to work.

The impact of the loss of the firms and jobs due to discontinuances on displacement can only be partially estimated. Employment figures on the displacees have only been available since and including 1961. Since then about 890 jobs are known to have been lost due to the demise of 322 firms. However, employment figures are available on approximately one-third of the liquidated firms; it is unknown what percentage of the remainder actually employed no persons.⁵ Other studies have indicated only about ten percent of the firms fall within this no employee category and thus it would seem reasonable to assume that the total losses exceeded one thousand jobs. From this value must be subtracted the estimated number of jobs that would have been lost under "normal" circumstances. If we concede that the majority of the firms liquidated due to forced displacement, that there existed a high probability that most firms could have continued indefinitely, then a reasonable assumption for a "normal" liquidation rate might be a few percent above the national norm - say 10%. This means that fifty percent, one-half the 1961-7 liquidation rate of approximately 20%, of the total losses, 500 jobs, could be said to be due to liquidations as a

consequence of displacement. The job loss due to the discontinuances of the displacees is then about .32 jobs/firm displaced. The estimated job losses to date due to discontinuances on displacement would then be about 610 and since 1820 firms are scheduled for displacement an additional loss of 580 jobs may be expected for a total of 1280.

The assumptions for the latter value are that the twenty percent liquidation rate will be maintained and that the characteristics of the firms will not change. However, the liquidation rate is subject to market changes and changes in firm characteristics. It is known that the firms will be slightly larger and that there will be a higher percentage of manufacturing firms; therefore, it would appear that this part of the assumption is causing a higher estimate than might occur. An evaluation of the possible effects of market changes has been postponed to a later point in this chapter.

Other employment losses than those due to business termination are possible through the relocation process. Among these are losses in employees on displacement, losses after displacement and during the adjustment period, and losses due to the dispersal of firms beyond the corporate boundaries of the city. The first of these possibilities has already been discussed and the survey results suggested that although a majority of the firms experienced changes in employment on displacement, the overall balance did not appear to be

disturbed. The third possibility probably accounts for greater losses to the city than all the discontinuances.

The redevelopment authority found that of all the businesses that relocated about 11.7% went outside the city. Most firms relocate with a $\frac{1}{4}$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ mile from the area from which they were dislocated.⁶ Zimmer found that those firms with less dependence on a localized market tended to move the farthest and thus we would expect that the larger firms, most likely wholesalers and the manufacturing industries, would make the longer moves and be most likely to leave the city. It is not surprising to find then that a greater percentage, 13.5% of the manufacturing firms left. Unfortunately the BRA has not published figures for the other classifications, but it seems reasonable to assume that employee losses due to dispersal estimated using the 11.7% value will be a minimum and since the number of manufacturing firms as a percentage of displacement is expected to increase, it is likely that higher volume of losses due to dispersal may be expected in the future.

If the same assumptions that were made earlier still hold for the liquidated businesses and for the firms whose labor force is unknown, then an estimated total labor force of 8,850 was relocated since 1961. Using the dispersal rate of 11.7%, we find that about 1030 jobs have left the city due to displacement. There is an additional problem of subtracting what might have been a "normal" rate of departure

but the value is unknown and for the purposes of argument it is assumed negligible. The job loss due to the departure of displacees is then about .65 jobs/firm displaced. The total employment loss to the city to date through dispersal is about double that due to discontinuances, at 1230 jobs, and if we include the firms scheduled for displacement an additional loss of 1180 jobs may be expected for a total of 2410. As was noted above this is probably a minimum value due to the expected increased size and changed type of firm displaced.

The impact of employment losses and dislocation on different sectors of the city's economic base undoubtedly varies for about 50% of all the jobs lost were in the retail trades, but it is difficult enough to evaluate losses for the city as a whole and even more so for the individual sectors. Fluctuations in employment have occurred and generally have been in decline in the city for all categories except the services which between 1958 and 1965 increased by about 16½% or approximately 8,400 jobs.⁷ Wholesale trade industries lost 5,100 jobs or about 11% and retail trade industries lost about 2,100 jobs or 2.8% of the total retail labor force between 1958 and 1965. The largest decrease among the four major categories was for the manufacturing industries with a loss of 13.5% equivalent to a reduction of over 12,300 jobs. The heavy gains apparent

in the service sector thus distort the trend in the other three sectors. Of all the jobs lost through discontinuances via forced dislocation, the services accounted for but 14% and the other three sectors over 70%. It therefore seems reasonable to ignore the impact on the services, subtract this category from the employment figures for the city as a total and accept the slight statistical error that will occur.

Employment for Boston, less services and government, declined from 315,500 in 1958 to 205,000 in 1965 for a loss of about 10,500 jobs. An estimated 840 jobs were lost through forced dislocation by either business terminations or departures between 1958 and 1967. Between 16 and 18% of the dislocations and loss of employment occurred in the years 1966-67 and thus the estimated loss for '58 - '65 is approximately 1530 jobs or about 145 of the decline noted for that period. It can hardly be concluded that the rate of decline has been significantly affected by the activities of the renewal authorities.

The third possibility for employment loss or gain occurs during the adjustment period and the time after "successful" relocation. In order to get some idea of the magnitude of the changes information was requested through the survey on changes in employment after relocation. Even though the firms are in a different stage of development and adjustment after the move, because the time period between the move and

the time of questionnaire varies, it is still helpful to consider the information. Two things are in our favor. The first is that over 98% of the respondents were relocated after 1960 and secondly that the returns are fairly symmetrical, i.e., balanced about the year 1964, and thus presumably the average time since displacement should be about two years - the end of the time period most observers feel to be the most critical.⁸

Approximately 85% of the 238 survey firms volunteered information on employee changes after relocation and of these about 17% lost employees, 58% remained the same and the labor force of 25% increased. It is estimated that total gains exceeded total losses by about eighty-five employees or approximately .41 employees/relocated firm.⁹

If the same period of time from 1958 to 1967 is again adopted then about 1480 firms relocated and from this must be subtracted the somewhat arbitrary 10% for unsuccessful relocations and 11.7% for departures from the city. The remaining 1160 firms would then have an estimated labor force increase of about 470 employees or about 75% of those lost through liquidation. Thus after a period of two to three years it would appear that a significant portion of the losses due to discontinuances had been recouped. In the face of general decline of employment in Boston this would appear to be a fairly favorable situation but this conclusion may be biased by the greater number of survey respondents,

especially service firms, that have been displaced during the recent upturn in business activity. The upturn has been accompanied by a rise in the liquidation rate and consequently a higher growth rate among those firms that did manage to relocate may be only offsetting increased losses due to discontinuances. Furthermore, just as the business upturn is thought to be atypical, so might the growth rate be only short-term and thus atypical of the general situation. In addition, it should be remembered that the city lost twice as many jobs through departures than were lost through discontinuances.

The redevelopment authority has acquired a known, six and one-half million square feet of floor space since 1958 and since information as to the size of about 22% of all the displacees was not available then the total might be expected to exceed eight million square feet. About 10% of the space was acquired from firms that liquidated and another 12% from firms that departed from the city and therefore the question arises as to where the remaining 6.5 million square feet of required relocation space was found.¹⁰ Since an additional six to seven million square feet will be needed in the next five years it is neither a trivial nor an academic question, for the absence of this space could cause the discontinuance rate to rise and greater numbers of businesses to attempt to leave the city in search of space. Thus the possibility of increasing economic and

employment losses to the city may occur if the necessary space cannot be found.

There is quite a natural turnover of real estate and building space within any city due to the number of firms establishing anew, discontinuing, and relocating. Likewise there are also several ways by which space is destroyed and created. Buildings are removed from active use through fires, and private and city clearance efforts and are replaced and added to through redevelopment and building programs. It is a near impossibility to keep track of changes in the quantities and type of space that changes owners or is destroyed and rebuilt over any given period of time. Furthermore, the relocation space needs of dislocated firms form a submarket within this total real estate framework. The firms are smaller than normal and their rent structure is, with the exception of the service industries, far below the \$2.50 to \$3.00/sq. ft. paid for new industrial space. This means that if space is to become available to these firms it must generally come via two methods. The first is through the construction of new space that can be occupied by firms that can afford it who then release the older and less desirable space to other firms through the "trickling process". However, most concede that Boston has been chronically short of land for commercial and industrial building. The one exception to this has been in the service industries where

heavy amounts of new space have been constructed in high-rise buildings and it may be assumed that a fair amount of the space made available through this process has been available to the professionals and business services.

The other possibility that space needs of potential relocatees will be met is through the "method" utilized in the past - that of depending on an undiminishing volume of space to be vacated by firms either terminating operations or departing from the city faster than others can establish anew. Thus the decline of commercial activity in the city would have to continue at a rate sufficient to keep pace with the number of estimated relocatees. The estimated volume, by the number of firms to be displaced for the next six years, once corrections have been made that assume the status quo as regards liquidations and departures, is apparently very close to the number of displacements since 1961 or the last five years.

As has been previously noted, employment losses have occurred in the manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade sectors of the Boston economy. This loss of employment has also been generally matched by a loss of firms in each sector and thus since 1958 there has been a loss of about 74 firms, 96 firms and 83 firms per year, respectively.¹¹ The estimated and adjusted number of manufacturing firms that has been or is to be relocated is about one-third to one-half of these net losses. The number of wholesale firms as a percentage

of net loss varies between one-quarter and one-third and that for retail firms between approximately two-thirds and three quarters. It seems appropriate to remind the reader once again that the relocation loads represent but a subsector by volume and the type of demand for space and thus the quantity of space that is opened up through this process is not necessarily suitable to relocatee needs.

The decline of the three sectors under consideration actually goes back to 1951 and probably previous to that and therefore the size of the backlog or reserves is important - it is also unknown. However, the demands on this space have not been small for about five million square feet of space were eliminated during the construction of the Central Artery which occurred prior to 1958 and an additional 121 businesses were relocated from the New York Streets renewal project for which data was not available for this study.¹²

The decline of commercial and industrial businesses has not been constant for in 1964 a definite upswing is evident in all sectors including the services. It is generally conceded that since then the nation has entered a prosperous period and thus the upturn is probably atypical of long-term trends. If the above assumptions that have been made are at least partly correct then a corresponding upward swing in the liquidation rates should occur that would probably be more noticeable for the retail and service firms than the

others and which would lag behind the upward swing in the economy. The discontinuance rate for all firms drops from early highs in 1958 to lows in 1961 and 1962, then rises just after a period of heavy volume and then falls to low in 1965. In 1966 the rate climbs and in the first quarter of 1967 it is up quite sharply. Any sizeable dislocations for wholesale firms did not really begin until 1962 and the rate is generally low until 1964-65 and then it drops sharply in 1966 and is up again in the first quarter of 1967. The discontinuance rate for service firms is steady until 1965-66 when it drops sharply due to an absence of personal service firms. However, separate examination of the two types of service firms reveals their liquidation rates have actually been rising but that this fact is obscured if both are examined as one.

The rates for manufacturing firms are generally steady but do increase slightly after the heavy displacement load in 1962 and the rate for 1967 is up sharply but on a very low volume of displacements. The discontinuance rate for retail firms generally trends downward from 1958 to 1961 and 1962 and then after a period of heavy displacement rises again with highs from 1965 to 1967.¹³

Although the comparisons are far from being conclusive, the discontinuance rates do present a fairly sympathetic reaction to both an increase in volume and the upward swing in the economy. The reactions tend to lag behind the period

of heavy loads and the upswing and are also most noticeable for retail and service firms.

In conclusion then, we have found that dislocation activities have affected a surprisingly high percentage of the total business community. Twenty-five percent of the retail trade establishments and fifteen percent of the wholesalers have been or will be displaced by 1972. Because the displacees are smaller than the typical firm however, it is estimated that for the different types of firms, between six and eleven percent of all employees in Boston will have been affected. Furthermore, because the firms and particularly the manufacturing industries involved, hire more persons with lower skills than is typical for the rest of the city, over one employed person in ten in the ghetto areas will be affected by the displacements.

It has been estimated that the job losses due to discontinuances averages about .32 persons per firm and the number of jobs lost to the city through departures of firms to outlying areas is estimated to be about .65 jobs per firm displaced. By 1972, estimated job losses under present and past relocation practices and market conditions should have reached totals of 1,280 from discontinuances and about 2400 due to departures for a total employment loss to the city of 3,680 jobs. However, it appeared that after two to three years a majority of the job losses due to discontinuances

had been made up by growth in the surviving, relocated firms. An unknown number of new jobs created within the renewal areas might further compensate for dislocation losses. Although job losses due to relocation may be negative, the total renewal process could have positive, favorable results.

The rate of departure or of terminations of business activities for the city as a whole is apparently a critical factor in successful relocation for the space vacated through such activities appears to provide the bulk of relocation space. The rate at which space becomes available is due to general business activities and thus an upswing in general business activity lowers the rate at which space becomes available and thus appears to result in an increase in the number of discontinuances among dislocatees. Thus the timing of the relocation load and the magnitude of it, i.e., the amount of absorptive pressure placed upon the market, appear to be variables influencing the discontinuance rate.

FOOTNOTES

IMPACT ON THE CITY

¹Industrial and Commercial Business Relocation,
Table II.

²Appendix, p. 36. Note: The totals are minimums as one-third of all firms employed zero or an unknown number of persons.

³Appendix, p. 36.

⁴A. M. Olins, Characteristics and Trends of Boston's Labor Force (Boston, 1967), Section D, p. 6-7.

⁵Appendix, p. 50.

⁶Olins, p. A-11, Table IV; James H. Saalberg, A Study of Business Dislocation Caused by the Boston Central Artery (Cambridge, 1959) pp. 59-63; and Zimmer, p. 116.

⁷Olins, p. A1-A3. Note: Additional unpublished data was also obtained through the aid of the Division of Employment Security of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts.

⁸Kinnard, Statement, p. 3, also Appendix, p. 33.

⁹Appendix, pp. 180-110.

¹⁰Appendix, p. 37.

¹¹Unpublished data, Division of Employment Security, Boston, Massachusetts.

¹²Saalberg, pp. 31-39. The amount of space that was occupied by the displacees was estimated from the data supplied on the number of firms and employees.

¹³Appendix, pp. 63, 68, 73, 78, 83 and 88.

RELOCATION PROGRAM

Three different types of services are commonly available to firms dislocated under the urban renewal program. The first of these is the reimbursements and grants that are made to cover property losses and moving expenses and the general hardships of dislocation. The second is a disaster loan program administered by the Small Business Administration that was originally set up to aid businesses that suffered economic injury due to natural disasters and which was extended to cover displaced businesses. The third type of service is non-cash benefits that may include technical and managerial assistance. Of the three service types, the first has been by far the most useful and effective.

Reimbursements to Boston firms totaled over 4.7 million dollars between 1958 and 1967 with an average of about thirty-four hundred dollars per firm. However, about 45% of all firms received under \$1000. Due to somewhat more liberalized specifications as to what could be compensated, and how much could be paid, the median disbursement for property losses and moving expenses rose from about \$500 in 1958-60 to around \$1500 thereafter. As one might expect the median payment varies with the size and the type of firm. For one-person firms the median is about \$500 and 70% of these firms receive under \$1000 whereas for two to three persons the median lies between \$1000 and \$1500 and 43% receive less than \$1000. The

median for four to five and six to seven person firms is about \$2500 to \$3000 and increases to over \$5000 for firms that are larger.¹

Disbursements to manufacturing firms run the largest for any type of firm with a minimum median for the smaller firms of between \$1-1500 and for the larger between \$10-25,000. In contrast to this the minimum median for the smaller service firms is about \$500 and the maximum exceeds \$2500. Retail and wholesale trade minimum and maximum medians range between these two extremes with the payments to the wholesale firms running larger than those for retail.

The median payments for moving expenses and property losses are generally steady over time after about 1961-62, with the exception of the manufacturing industries, where the trend of the payments is definitely upward - an apparent expression of upward trend in the size of the displacees. Compensation to displacees has increased, however, under the provisions of the Small Business Displacement Payment grant program.

Average amounts of total payments that includes both compensation for expenses and loss, and the grants, have increased for all types of firms with the exception of the wholesalers. SBDP payments to retail and service firms have been made to about 45 to 48% of the firms displaced since 1964 and about one-third of the wholesale trade and manufacturing firms have been covered under the program.

Average total payments to service firms, excluding the high and low extremes, ranges from \$500 to \$2,700 per firm and the trend is definitely upward. An upward trend is also apparent in payments to retail trade establishments where the averages range from \$900 to \$4,200 per firm. An increase in payments to the manufacturing industries was noted under the normal compensation program and this trend is of course enhanced by SBDP grants.

The reader will recall that displaced businesses that meet certain requirements, particularly income limitations that specify that the firms gross receipts or sales must have totaled over \$1,500, and average annual net income before taxes and including certain wages, salaries, etc., did not exceed a maximum of \$10,000, are eligible for receipt of a Small Business Displacement Payment. This grant was intended to cover loss of income and profits, monies and time spent incidental to moving, loss of good will, and costs generally incurred in adjusting to a new location or loss of employment due to a forced discontinuance.

To the best of the author's knowledge, this particular section of the law that provides additional compensation to displaced businesses had its origin in a subcommittee of the House Committee on Public Works and was originally seen as a fixed payment in lieu of reimbursement for actual expenses.² The displaced person would have the option of accepting the

payment which would be equal to the average annual net earnings over a two year period or \$5,000, whichever was less, and the earnings were to be established by income tax returns pertinent to that period. Disbursement payments to Boston firms indicate that about 85% of all firms received less than \$5000 for moving expenses and property losses and thus the adoption of such a procedure would have simplified immeasurably the claims process of determining what is or is not compensable, the obtaining of three qualified bidders, and supposedly eliminated the long delays in requesting and receiving payments. Although the fixed payment option was not introduced and the firms that qualify are now eligible to receive \$2,500 in addition to moving expenses and property losses, the payment on the basis of net annual income and tax return verification was retained. Just how simple and fast the process is, is somewhat questionable and although the original proponent of the plan felt that:

This payment could be made to a displaced business concern within a week from the time of a move, with a minimum of red tape and administrative expense.³

the fact remains that for over 60% of the firms, the processing of these claims took over four months - the request for disbursements for moving expenses, once filed, have been acted on quicker, for only 45% of the firms experienced delays over four months!⁴ It is unknown whether governmental

administrative expenses are less. The actual time to receive the payments after the move was made has exceeded four months for over three-quarters of the firms.

The use of the average annual net earning limitation to determine the recipients of the grants has proved to be quite successful. Approximately two-fifths of the Boston displacees received the grant after the money became available and the payments generally conformed nicely to the size and type of firm that has experienced the greatest difficulties in relocation.⁵ If the twenty-two types of businesses were ranked according to the percentage of discontinuances, five of the top eight categories would also be among those receiving the highest percentage values for number of firms receiving the SBDP's. Seventy-six percent of the firms that received SBDP's employed less than four persons and ninety-two percent employed less than eight, whereas only sixty and eighty percent, respectively, of all sizes of firms fell into those size limitations. Those firms that did not receive the payments were generally larger with over one-half employing over three persons and tended to be in those business categories with lower liquidation rates. By size of firm, the liquidation rates generally ranged two-thirds or less than those firms receiving the payments and the overall liquidation rate was one-half that of the SBDP recipients or 15% as compared to 30%.

Most businessmen feel that they should be quite liberally and fairly compensated for costs they feel they have incurred in the behalf of the public's interest. Besides the loss of income prior to relocation, the businesses incur remodeling, renovation, and alteration costs in the preparation of newly acquired space. To this must be added the actual cost of moving equipment and inventory, advertising the new location, legal fees for the leasing or purchasing of new space and a variety of other incidentals. Compensation is not paid for time lost or spent in searching for a new location, a task that took over six months for about one half of the relocatees, nor is it paid for loss of time in preparation of the move or the period of time the business is inoperable due to the move. The determination of what can be compensated, even under the area of property loss and the movement of goods, is sometimes seemingly arbitrary and requires good communication between the displacee and the relocation department.

The trouble seems to stem from several different sources. One of these is the uniqueness of the individual firms that may involve different kinds of building space, a wide variety of different equipment used, and the process and means that the management had developed to facilitate the move. Another problem area is the usual infirmities that surround a bureaucracy. The plaintive cries of red tape, unreasonable

delays, politics and even corruption, abound.⁶ Part of the problem can probably be attributed to the competency of some of the relocation officials, their lack of business experience and an understandable unwillingness to assume responsibility for moving costs and expenses. Another part of the problem can be attributed to the law itself for what may appear to be an entirely reasonable action to the businessman may not necessarily be compensable under the law. For instance, a retail merchant finds that he is going to need shelving on which to display his goods in the new store. He analyzes the different alternatives and quite correctly finds that it would be cheaper to buy new metal shelving than to hire carpenters to tear up the wooden ones that he now has, incur considerable damage in the dismantling process, and then pay to have them reinstalled. However, the law attempts to maintain the status quo and will not allow the businessman to improve his property as a consequence of the move and thus the problem arises as to what constitutes an improvement. The simple correction of this one specific problem, that of the substitution of new shelving for old, would probably take a lot of complaints off the relocation specialists desk.

Some of the problems of compensability are not so simple as the question of the shelves. What about the firm that finds suitable building space that has insufficient power

distribution facilities? What about a heavy machine that requires secure and vibration free attachment to the structure - is structural reinforcement and the cost of mounting compensable? The ire of the businessman is soon raised in an all too often unsuccessful attempt to get fast and "reasonable" answers. The problem was illustrated by a couple of survey respondents:

Once we spoke to the head of the section that we were dealing with, the service we got was satisfactory but we did feel that the amount of manpower used in surveys, etc., etc., was about three times more than necessary (to the chagrin of the author)

We also felt that the rigidity with which they were held to cost fund formulae was, in many cases, ridiculous. In other words if you had direct current motors in your present building, which they would replace, but you were going to alternating current, they could not give you alternating current motors. We bought new materials which they would not authorize, so we spent more money moving old stuff which was not as satisfactory as the new stuff would have been.

The process also acts to undermine any meaningful communication that may have developed between the authority and the businessman -

Probably the best thing that could have happened to us was to be forced to move - we should have done this years ago...In the area of our claim for moving expenses one inspector, let's say the first, paints a rosy picture about all they will pay for. East succeeding one you meet chops away at what you thought was coming to you and at the same time adds to the requirements (paper work, bid qualifications, etc.) to

get what he thinks is "compensible". I am convinced that this is a planned, systematic way of discouraging the small business man from pressing and pursuing what is rightfully coming to him. I could go on for an hour.....

The problems are not confined to remodeling and alteration phase of the move. In order to validate the cost of the move the authority requires that three qualified bids be obtained for the job. This means that movers must be found that are willing to work within the limitations imposed by the system and are willing to estimate the costs of the move:

(I suggest that you....) eliminate red tape and the delay in checking outside movers. The red tape and up to six months it requires for the Redevelopment to compensate the outside truckers had made all small efficient truckers refuse to bid on Redevelopment jobs and left them in the hands of the bigger and generally more expensive truckers, who can afford to wait six months before their bills can be paid.

Another business man had problems of a slightly different nature:

Besides the normal traumatic experiences of moving a business one must contend with a certain amount of hocus pocus in the BRA business relocation office, particularly within the appraisal area, where the decision of one individual, can cause great anguish if his assessment of the moving situation differs from that of your three qualified bidders.

The complaints of the businessmen are not unfounded.

A heavy volume of moves is handled by about six or seven moving

firms (hard data unavailable) and some of the businesses are unwilling to accept the services of the lowest bidder whose work they feel would be shoddy. Survey data indicated that about two-fifths of the firms experienced what they felt to be excessive delays in receiving reimbursements for moving expenses. Approximately two-fifths of the firms' claims for expenses were in processing by the renewal authorities for four months or more.⁷

The survey firms were asked whether they would have been able to remain in business if they had not been reimbursed for moving expenses, in an effort to determine of what value the businessmen thought the payments were beyond the simple moral obligation of the government to pay for renewal costs. The results generally correlate by type of business to the median size of the payment received. Thus the manufacturing firms, that as a group received larger payments, generally felt that fewer would have been able to remain in business without the payment than any other group. Also, the service firms, that as a group received the smallest payments, generally felt that they would have been able to remain in business without assistance. Forty-two percent of the manufacturing firms and only twenty percent of the service firms attributed their "successful" relocation to the disbursements. About one-third of the wholesale and retail trade businesses reached the same conclusion. Even though the estimates of these businessmen

would appear to be somewhat exaggerated, it is still important that they believe that they are able to remain in business because of these payments.⁸

In an additional effort to check on the effect of the payments in reducing the discontinuance rates and therefore the loss of jobs, the characteristics of those firms that did not receive reimbursements for moving expenses and property losses, about 20% of the total number of firms, were also checked. Those firms that took the option of not qualifying for loans, the "prior move-outs", were excluded, and also those firms that had to be classified as "unknowns" by the redevelopment authority. Unfortunately of course, this still left among the remainder those that did not choose to apply for funds as well as those that were denied payments for other reasons.

The unremunerated firm is smaller than normal with about 72% of the firms employing under four persons versus the usual sixty percent. The liquidation rates for the smaller firms were about the same or lower than that for the typical reimbursed firm but an increase in size was accompanied by an increase in the rate. Unremunerated firms employing six to seven persons had rates of 28% versus the usual 20% and those in the eight to nineteen category had rates of 35% versus the usual 11 percent. A check on the unremunerated firms by rentals revealed that in the lowest category the rate was 50%

and in the highest 19% and when compared to the respective values for all firms of 40% and 17%, suggests the absence of the payment does increase the liquidation rate. The liquidation rate for all firms in the middle rental categories fluctuates between 18 and 24% with no trend accompanying an increase in rentals, but for the unremunerated firm paying the higher rentals, the liquidation rate is lower. For those firms paying under \$.75 per square foot the rate ranges from 25 to 50% with an average of about one-third whereas those paying over \$.75, the rate fluctuates between 10 and 22% and averages about one-fifth.⁹

The liquidation rate for service and manufacturing firms that are not reimbursed is about 50% higher than that for all firms of those types and that for wholesalers is about two and one-half times normal. Somewhat surprisingly the liquidation rate for retail firms was about 30% or five to six percent below the norm. There are several reasons that might account for this and the most reasonable would seem to be that the payments have had the least effect on reducing liquidation rates in this category. The percentage of discontinuances for this category for all firms far exceeds that for any other; this category has the most difficult time in re-locating and is least able to improve the quality of working conditions and location through relocation. Another reason might be the more selective nature of the type of retail firm

that does not receive payments. Only about 17% of all the retail firms went unremunerated whereas approximately one-third of all wholesale firms received no payment. Also, between one-fifth and one-quarter of the service and manufacturing firms went without reimbursements. These conclusions are not necessarily contradictory to the survey results that suggested that the service firms should be the least affected by the payments. It should be remembered that the survey firms had "successfully" relocated and by that time a very high percentage of all the retail firms had liquidated and thus a correlation is not particularly valid.

The inclusion of businesses displaced under federally aided programs in a category eligible for disaster loans available from the Small Business Administration was a step that was originally well conceived. The displaced business loans should have been valuable in assisting businesses to adjust to their new locations by providing the working capital necessary to carry the business through the adjustment period, by allowing the business to expand or adjust and make conversions in the new property, and by permitting it to make equipment replacements and to generally upgrade the business. Although the traditional emphasis has been on financial assistance, the Administration is also empowered to provide technical and managerial services as well.¹⁰ Ideally the

program would work as one New Haven renewal official described and related that the work of the business relocation staff was well supplemented by the SBA and that experts had been sent to project offices. He concluded that:

...in Connecticut the program of the Small Business Administration is an important, active service, out in the field, selling itself to businessmen who might otherwise be unaware of the opportunities available to them.¹¹

It is unfortunate but the New Haven experience would appear to be the exceptional rather than the typical experience. Between 1961 and 1964, or over about a three year period, the number of displaced business disaster loans was very small and the nationwide average was about twenty-three per quarter.¹² During hearings before a house subcommittee on small businesses the following conversation ensued between Congressman Horton and SBA administrator Foley:

Mr. Horton...Now, I was wondering if, in your experience, you find that you have been able to save enough of these businesses and whether or not it is your recommendation that this type of program be expanded?

Mr. Foley...I cannot recommend expanding the program until I get more information as to the needs. But again, we have made 396 loans under the present program, and of those 396 I imagine that at least half of them have gone out of business, if not a greater percentage.

Mr. Horton...I wonder if this is due to a failure of promotion. I am not criticizing your agency, but - and you will certainly agree with me - there are many instances in which people are not aware of these programs. I know that the urban renewal people are doing their best to publicize it insofar as their areas are concerned, but I wonder if

you would have a lot more applications if more information were known about the various programs.

Mr. Foley...That is very likely true.

Mr. Horton...Are you satisfied with the number of loans that have been made? You seem to feel that this is a good number.

Mr. Foley...I don't know, Mr. Horton. I think one of the purposes these hearings will serve is to give a better picture of whether they are meeting the need. I just don't know. We just have to have more information. And we don't have that type of data.¹³

Sometime after the hearings the SBA was directed to supplement the activities of the renewal authorities in rendering assistance to the displaced businessman and the SBA now sends each firm a letter describing the assistance available upon receiving lists of firm names, addresses, and information as to type of business from the LPA. The above conversation is revealing however, in that after three years of program operation the SBA still had not become aware of the needs of businessmen, the characteristics of the displaced firm, or even bothered to become acquainted with the data that was available.

To date approximately six percent of all Boston relocatees have received an SBA loan, a figure that would suggest that the program is underutilized because so few have taken advantage of the long-term, below market interest rate monies available. Of the firms receiving the loans about two-fifths occupied a

floor area of less than 3000 sq. ft. and only about one-quarter employed less than four persons. Since about 70% of all displacees occupy less than 3000 sq. ft. and 60% employ less than four persons, it is not difficult to conclude that the SBA is making loans to firms that are probably financially more sound than is typical and certainly to a larger, atypical set of firms that is more likely to have a lower discontinuance rate. The Administrator's estimate that one-half of the firms to which the SBA makes loans go out of business after relocation, if true, suggests that the administration has found a peculiar set of firms indeed. A high liquidation rate of fifty percent is seldom found even upon forced displacement and then probably only among very small firms in the lower rental categories.¹⁴

The under utilization of the loan program is undoubtedly partially due to the lack of interest in the SBA for promoting the program, but there is the qualification to be made that they had financial difficulties, there is some reluctance among small businessmen to borrow money from the government through a process that requires the hiring of lawyers and maneuvering through the bureaucratic red tape. In addition, many although aware of the program, may not realize the benefits, financial leverage, that could accrue through the borrowing below market rate money and some are probably reluctant to borrow at all. The fact that the larger firms are borrowing, besides suggesting that the SBA selectively picks the recipients,

also suggests that the larger firms may have more aggressive and better informed management.

The SBA has adopted one policy that ironically enough is regressive the smaller the firm. By limiting the amount of expansion possible upon relocation to one-third of the floor space at the old location, the Small Business Administration, in an attempt to control flagrant misuse of the loan program, has adopted a policy that actually is detrimental to the smaller businesses.

The post-relocation survey data revealed that nearly 40% of the firms increased in size over twenty-five percent and at least 32% increased in size over 50% and thus between one-third and two-fifths of all relocated firms have been excluded by the expansion requirement.¹⁵ It may be recalled from previous statements that 65% of all relocated firms either decreased or increased in size over twenty-five percent - this fact suggests that a problem of geometry is involved that may account for the heavy changes and not necessarily one of decision. For example, a firm that occupies 6000 sq. ft. may add only 1800 sq. ft. of floor space if it is still to qualify for the loan. This would provide a useable room of about 30' x 60'. However, only about 20% of displacees occupy a floor area over 5000 sq. ft. and nearly twice that many occupy 1000 sq. ft. or less. Thus, a merchant with a twenty foot street frontage would be allowed to move from a space

that is 20' x 50' to one 25' x 53' or 20' x 67' or 27' x 50' and therefore, even though the increase be a third, the actual increase is so small that the problem of finding a location with about the same amount of space may mean taking a shop with that much increase whether it is needed or not. The increase in space may not be even "usable" in terms of a better functioning business.

A comprehensive critical evaluation of the non-cash benefits, services, made available to dislocatees would require an intimate exposure to the relocation process from within that has not been available to the author. However, there are several points that can be fairly made as to the extensiveness of the application of such a program, the degree of communication between the renewal agency, and the relocatee, and the expressed attitudes of the survey respondents in regards to their relationship with the agency.

Many of the survey respondents, when questioned as to whether they found any of the services of the Business Relocation Department helpful, simply answered, "No". About twenty percent of the respondents found the relocation personnel "friendly" and "cooperative" but less than one tenth noted that they had received information and help in filing claims.¹⁶ Many businessmen felt, however, that the reimbursement program was a service that was rightfully theirs and thus probably were not inclined to think of the relocation department as helpful in administering it. Some of the businessmen replied

quite positively to the question and replied, "They were helpful in advising us on various ways to make a more efficient move," and another wrote, "The personal attention to problems was very good." Some of the businessmen obviously tried to be kind yet seemed to feel that little had really been done and replied, "they tried very hard" and "they were understanding". Some simply indicated that they did not even request any assistance from the authority while others were quite vehement and attacked the agency. Many cited problems of red tape, promises made by officials on which they were later unable to deliver and difficulties in receiving compensation for costs. There were also the expected charges of "politics", "land chiseling" and some simply thought the relocation services were "worthless" and that many of the officials were "errand boys" - an accusation that was accompanied by suggestions to hire more qualified personnel - a problem that has not been entirely overlooked by relocation administrators. One businessman caustically summed up his impressions on the entire relocation process: "We should not waste tax money on this class of people. Actually, they were a hindrance."

However one may interpret the emotional and caustic outbursts of some of the businessmen and the feeling by many that they simply received no assistance, the fact remains that the communication that is necessary between relocation personnel and relocatees is all too often lacking. Although

the statistical information is inconclusive, there is reason to believe that the failure to establish contact between the two parties leads to higher liquidation rates and business losses. Information on one-third of the firms as to the number of persons employed and on twenty-two percent of the firms as to the amount of square footage occupied, has never been recorded. How is it possible to provide relocation assistance to these firms when even basic information as to their size is lacking? The process of acquiring information has apparently improved over time with about 20% of employment figures and 17% of square footage statistics being absent after 1960 - a considerable improvement. Information on rental rates varied around 21-22% for all years.¹⁷ A check on the firms that went unremunerated, and it will be recalled, have higher liquidation rates, showed that employment information was lacking on 47% of all these firms and that rental information was unavailable on thirty-one percent. This suggests that the failure of the firms to contact the redevelopment authority or vice versa, contributes to the greater number of discontinuances.

Personnel problems, salary levels and lack of good administration have also contributed the low level of advisory services. Wm. Kinnard reported, after surveying a number of renewal agencies, that many agencies were understaffed and overworked which suggests that the services they were providing

were in the area of financial assistance. He further indicated that many agencies were not large enough to have a research division and in the probability that they were, then many did not have the funds or personnel or were not in a position to stop and evaluate policy, technique or the future deployment of resources. One local former renewal official noted that many of the relocation "experts" had never been in business and lacked experience; that the salaries paid were too low to attract the really qualified people required to do more than process claims - that salary levels were between \$5 and \$7000, and that some had no understanding of the firms, the market, labor requirements or of real estate and real estate transactions. Cumulatively, this meant that there was lack of ability to assist the businessmen in picking a possible site and of course the inability to render any sort of technical assistance.¹⁸

The survey firms were questioned about how they felt about the way in which their relocation was handled and also if they felt that they received adequate compensation to help them make a successful move in an attempt to determine whether their attitudes toward the relocation process had improved over time. Due to the low number of responses from firms relocating in the early years it was possible only to check on improvements in the later years versus the earlier years rather than draw a picture of change over the entire 10 years

that the survey was to have covered.¹⁹

Approximately two-fifths of the survey firms felt that the payments adequately compensated them and about one-half indicated that they felt the payments were inadequate and the remainder gave no answer. Only about 20% of all the retail firms felt they had been adequately compensated whereas over fifty percent of the service and professional firms felt the same way. For those firms employing less than six persons, the number believing they had been adequately reimbursed varied between one-half and two-thirds and for firms larger than that, between one-quarter and one-half concurred. There is a distinct break point in the change in attitudes of the firms as to the adequacy of the compensation that occurs between 1963 and 1964 that coincides with the time the Small Business Displacement Payment was introduced. Prior to 1964 only one-third of those firms that gave an evaluation felt that the compensation was adequate and after 1963 nearly three-fifths concurred.

An improvement in the subjective attitudes of the survey respondents as to the way in which they were relocated generally correlates to the changes felt as to the adequacy of the payments. Ten percent of the respondents declined to answer the question, but of all those that did, about one-third responded affirmatively to each of the three categories:

fine-positive, neutral, and negative. Although the selection of the same 1963-64 break point is somewhat arbitrary in this case, the respondents did indicate a significant change in attitude at about this time. Prior to 1964 about one-fifth felt positive as to the way in which they were relocated and slightly more than one third felt neutral. After 1963 more than two-fifths felt positive and slightly more than one-third felt neutral. Although some improvement was felt by all types of firms, the most dramatic changes occurred among the service and manufacturing firms. Prior to 1964 less than a quarter of the respondents in both categories felt positive and after that time over one-half of these firms felt positive. The improvement in attitude by wholesalers was very slight, but although retailers have generally felt negative or neutral over the entire period, the number of those feeling negative appears to have declined. Prior to 1963 about three-fifths of the firms felt negative and of the relocatees after that year only about two-fifths concurred.²⁰

It is possible, but unlikely, that the changes in the attitudes of the firms occurred not only because of the introduction of the SBDP but also due to an improvement in non-cash services. In checking the comments of the survey respondents as to their suggestions as to ways to improve the relocation process, the author found most of the comments made in reference to the financial assistance rendered by the

renewal authority and most of the remaining comments made dealt with the courteous and helpful attitude of the officials or accusingly made changes or political expediency and red tape. Seldom was mention made of any non-cash benefit rendered by the LPA and even when more information and better efforts for communication with the LPA were requested, it usually was in regard to financial compensation and the timing of the move. The author cannot but help conclude that the significant shift in attitudes by the relocatees as to the way in which they were relocated is primarily related to the introduction of the Small Business Displacement program and illustrates the significant impact of the program.

Overall, business relocation policy and procedures have improved over time and the greater coverage by both the numbers of firms receiving payments and the increasingly liberal payments and grants to dislocated firms, has been accompanied by generally lower liquidation rates. In view of this, the fact that unremunerated firms have higher liquidation rates, and that about one-third of the relocated survey respondents felt that they could not have remained in business without the payments, it seems logical to conclude that the payments have not only justly compensated firms for the relocation expenses incurred but have also made a significant contribution to the lowering of the discontinuance rate and the ensuing job losses. However, in spite of the increase payments it must be noted that the discontinuance rates in the retail trade

and personal service categories have been recently on the rise; this is apparently due to a lack of sufficient and acceptable relocation space. The possibility does exist that the more elderly proprietors and businessmen in these areas may be using the increased payments as an opportunity to disengage themselves from their businesses and retire, however, supporting data is lacking and the theory does not take in all categories of firms.

The Small Business Displacement Payment would appear to be an effective addition to the compensation received for moving expenses and property losses. Its area of coverage conforms nicely to the characteristics of the liquidated firms. Checks of the adequacy of compensation and the attitudes of the firms disclose significant improvements at the time the program was introduced.

The Small Business Disaster Loan program as presently applied under urban renewal relocation conditions would appear to be under utilized and therefore ineffective. The loan coverage by size of business fails to conform to the size characteristics of all displacees. The one-third maximum floor area size increase allowed recipients of the loans is regressive the smaller the firm. It would appear that the program simply lends credence to the dislocatees' complaints that relocation officials promise assistance programs but cannot deliver.

The redevelopment authority and the Small Business Administration have not adequately attempted to cope with the

difficulties of the dislocatees. Beyond the processing of claims and grants little has been done to provide most dislocatees, particularly the retail and personal service establishments that as a group exhibit the highest liquidation rates, with informational and technical assistance. The problem has been apparently compounded by the authority's reluctance to become actively involved in the real estate market and the dislocatees disinclination to trust the authorities and to accept advice.

RELOCATION PROGRAM

- ¹Appendix, pp. 124-128.
- ²Study of Compensation, pp. 130-132.
- ³Ibid., p. 131.
- ⁴Appendix, p.
- ⁵Appendix, pp. 149-153.
- ⁶Appendix, p. 163.
- ⁷Appendix, pp. 102, 125.
- ⁸Appendix, pp. 157-158.
- ⁹Appendix, pp. 129-130.
- ¹⁰Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration (Washington, 1964), p. 3.
- ¹¹Hearings Before the Subcommittee No. 5 (Washington, 1965), p. 60.
- ¹²Study of Compensation, p. 100.
- ¹³Hearings, pp. 15-16.
- ¹⁴Appendix, pp. 154-156, and p. 58.
- ¹⁵Appendix, p. 106.
- ¹⁶Appendix, p. 162.
- ¹⁷Appendix, pp. 42-47.
- ¹⁸John Alevizos, An Effective Program for the Relocation of Businesses from Urban Renewal Areas (Boston, 1963), pp. 17-22.
- ¹⁹Appendix, pp. 159-161.
- ²⁰Appendix, pp. 164-170.

CHAPTER VIII

COMMENTS

The business relocatee has been called the "forgotten man" in the renewal program. In the very early years he may have been forgotten but now he is misunderstood - and that is actually an improvement for it implies that he is at least recognized. He is misunderstood in the sense that his numbers and potential influence have been underestimated, the majority of his kind have been labeled marginal, and the services rendered unto him by his government have been inadequate, unresponsive to his needs, and given with some reluctance. Improvements have occurred to the degree that the businessman has been able to show that he has suffered private loss for the public's gain and has therefore been able to receive compensation for quantifiable and accountable items. Although the SBDP program appears to be a welcome departure from this practice in that grants are given in part for known yet non-quantifiable expenses, improvements in non-cash benefits have been very slow in coming.

It is the author's impression that many of those doing project planning are unaware of the cumulative effects of their decisions to dislocate businesses, that they consider them generally unattractive in physical appearance and therefore below standard, and that they tend to consider them one of the more expendable pieces of the urban fabric, without consideration to the many low-skilled jobs that they provide, in

their frenzied activities to open up housing opportunities, public open space and to provide the usual desired amenities. The dislocatees are seldom represented by organized pressure groups that can present and agitate for their needs that may be in conflict with the usual housing interests. It is true that the occasional business organization achieves considerable influence as those in Boston's CBD Project, but even here one may suspect that it was in large measure a Jordan Marsh and a Filene's that managed to protect their interests and stay put and Joe's Hamburger Shop that found itself moving. The point is that the planners that are creating the dislocation loads, as well as those providing the relocation services, need to develop a greater awareness of the consequences of their actions.

This study will have made its contribution if it helps to replace misconceptions with fact, explains the relocation process lucidly enough to create an impression on the reader that evokes some sympathy and an understanding of the difficulties and problems encountered, and if it can aid in the development of better federal and local programs for the dislocatees.

With the coming recognition of the urban crisis and the inevitable accompaniment of federal programs that the Model Cities Program prefigures and the increased degree of implementation of the renewal, highway and other programs that cause dislocation, hopefully will come the many subprograms that are necessary to implement the grand designs. The business

community has been called upon to help rebuild the cities and open job opportunities in the ghettos; the government in turn should recognize the impact of its actions on the business community, on the individual firms, and on the thousands of persons employed by the dislocatees.

APPENDIX I

PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS OVER TIME

Subject	<u>Page - Series A</u>
A. All Projects	1 - 6
1. Relocation Load by Type of Business Prior to Displacement	
2. Displacement Load Percentages by Projects and Type of Business	
3. Average Number of Employees Dis- placed Per Firm	
4. Average Amount of Floor Space Occupied Per Firm	
5. Average Amount of Space Used Per Employee	
6. Average Amount of Total Payments Per Firm	
B. West End Project	7 - 11
1. Number of Businesses	
2. Average Number of Employees Displaced	
3. Average Amount of Floor Space Occupied	
4. Average Amount of Yearly Rent	
5. Average Amount of Total Payments	
C. Government Center Project	12 - 16
D. Washington Park Project	17 - 21
E. Waterfront Project	22 - 26
F. Other Projects	27 - 31

- NOTE:
- (1) Percentage values calculated by the computer have been truncated and totals of columns (COL-PCNT) or rows (ROW-PCNT), etc., may not necessarily equal 100.
 - (2) Approximate median values on some of the tables have been calculated from the adjusted totals and are designated by a "0" encircling a number.
 - (3) The adjusted totals (ADJ.TOT.) are the actual totals less "unknowns" or "unknowns and move-outs"- whichever is appropriate.

RELOCATION LOAD BY TYPE OF BUSINESS PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

BUSINESS TYPE	FIRMS	LIQD.	PCNT
WHOLESALE			
FOOD	64	21	32
OTHER	139	13	9
RETAIL			
HARDWARE, ETC.	50	6	12
DRYGOODS	74	24	32
FOOD	103	37	35
CLOTHING	63	21	33
APPLN., FURN.	52	4	7
EATING	76	45	59
DRINK, LIQUOR	83	47	56
OTHER	129	26	20
STORAGE, DISTRIB	130	18	13
FINANCE, R.E.	63	5	7
PERSONAL SERVICE			
OTHER	147	39	26
BARBER, BEAUTY	65	27	41
BUS. SERV, PROF.	223	14	6
NONPROFIT	93	8	8
ROOMING HOUSES	71	42	59
MANUFACTURING			
PRINTING	60	4	6
FOOD	8	1	12
FABRC, APPAREL	35	2	5
OTHER	134	9	6
UNKNOWN, OTHER	38	7	18
TOTAL	<u>1900</u>	<u>420</u>	<u>22</u>

Displacement load percentages and total yearly business loads:

Project	date of displacement									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
ALL BUSINESSES										
West End	100	100	97	2	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gov't Center	--	--	3	98	98	40	21	44	18	12
Wash. Park	--	--	--	--	--	26	57	23	5	5
Waterfront	--	--	--	--	--	--	10	29	38	28
Other	--	--	--	--	2	34	12	4	39	55
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Actual Load	137	139	36	66	465	367	204	224	203	59
WHOLESALE BUSINESS										
West End	--	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gov't Center	--	--	--	100	98	65	9	6	3	--
Wash. Park	--	--	--	--	--	12	32	9	--	--
Waterfront	--	--	--	--	--	--	50	81	78	70
Other	--	--	--	--	2	23	9	3	19	30
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Actual Load	0	8	0	9	50	34	22	32	37	10
RETAIL BUSINESS										
West End	100	100	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gov't Center	--	--	--	100	99	37	5	24	8	10
Wash. Park	--	--	--	--	--	24	68	46	4	5
Waterfront	--	--	--	--	--	--	4	17	21	15
Other	--	--	--	--	.1	38	23	12	67	65
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Actual Load	73	59	15	19	138	156	56	41	52	19
STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION BUSINESS										
West End	100	100	67	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gov't Center	--	--	33	100	97	44	30	50	7	--
Wash. Park	--	--	--	--	3	12	50	25	21	--
Waterfront	--	--	--	--	--	--	20	25	43	33
Other	--	--	--	--	--	44	--	--	29	67
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Actual Load	13	9	3	8	34	25	10	8	14	3

Displacement load percentages and total yearly business loads:

Project	date of displacement									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
SERVICES AND PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS										
West End	100	100	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gov't Center	--	--	--	100	98	35	43	78	51	33
Wash. Park	--	--	--	--	--	45	48	15	2	17
Waterfront	--	--	--	--	--	--	3	5	26	17
Other	--	--	--	--	2	20	5	2	21	33
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Actual Load	22	28	5	13	92	65	60	91	47	12
MANUFACTURING BUSINESS FIRMS										
West End	100	100	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gov't Center	--	--	--	100	97	52	--	4	11	--
Wash. Park	--	--	--	--	--	9	75	17	--	--
Waterfront	--	--	--	--	--	--	9	78	43	25
Other	--	--	--	--	3	39	16	--	46	75
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Actual Load	15	9	2	7	102	31	12	23	28	8
OTHER, UNKNOWN BUSINESS FIRMS										
West End	100	100	100	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Gov't Center	--	--	--	100	98	28	18	36	12	17
Wash. Park	--	--	--	--	--	37	66	36	20	--
Waterfront	--	--	--	--	--	--	7	21	28	17
Other	--	--	--	--	2	33	9	7	40	66
Total	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>
Actual Load	14	26	11	9	48	54	44	28	25	6

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED,
BY TYPE OF BUSINESS, OVER TIME.

<u>BUSINESS TYPE</u>	<u>YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT.</u>									
	<u>58</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>67</u>
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	15	9	9	5	6	11	13
RETAIL	-0	-0	5	8	6	4	2	3	7	9
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	10	1	6	3	1	5	6
SERVICES, PROCF.	-0	-0	-0	4	5	3	8	4	6	3
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	10	11	12	8	12	14	19
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	14	6	2	1	4	10	5

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.),
BY TYPE OF BUSINESS, OVER TIME.

<u>BUSINESS TYPE</u>	<u>YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT</u>									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	51	0	88	137	93	36	69	103	121
RETAIL	14	13	15	17	39	26	28	23	63	114
STORAGE, DISTRIB	22	53	16	70	83	261	25	435	80	27
SERVICES, PROF.	6	11	4	8	14	19	13	10	19	11
MANUFACTURING	28	27	120	57	49	54	57	62	105	171
OTHER, UNKNOWN	46	32	23	27	31	29	17	70	45	12

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.) PER EMPLOYEE.
BY TYPE OF BUSINESS.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT											
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	6	15	10	8	11	8	9		
RETAIL	0	0	7	1	5	5	10	6	8	11		
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	10	68	87	23	1000	15	2		
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	1	2	5	1	2	3	3		
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	5	4	4	6	5	7	7		
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	1	5	11	6	21	4	3		

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TOTAL PAYMENTS (MOVING AND SBDP, 100'S),
BY TYPE OF BUSINESS, OVER TIME

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66*	67*
WHOLESALE	0	18	0	96	96	86	29	75	67	25
RETAIL	9	9	13	18	40	27	33	42	42	25
STORAGE, DISTRIB	2	2	5	-0	19	8	59	18	70	25
SERVICES, PROF.	5	7	2	6	14	12	27	17	37	25
MANUFACTURING	13	13	30	72	68	47	58	85	78	24
OTHER, UNKNOWN	3	2	1	14	14	10	10	34	17	25

*Payments from the first quarter of 1967 and last quarter of 1966 may have been in processing at the time of the study.

NUMBER OF BUSINESSES RELOCATED* FROM THE
WEST END PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
WHOLESALE	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3
RETAIL	73	59	15	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	148	47
STORAGE, DISTRIB	13	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	8
SERVICES, PROF.	22	28	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	18
MANUFACTURING	15	9	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	8
OTHER, UNKNOWN	14	26	11	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	52	17
TOTAL	137	139	35	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	313	

*Correction: DISLOCATED

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.)
OCCUPIED BY BUSINESSES IN THE WEST END PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RETAIL	14	13	15	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	22	53	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	6	11	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING	28	27	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	46	32	23	0	0	-0	0	0	0	0

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED, IN THE
WEST END PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RETAIL	-0	-0	5	-0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	0	0	-0	0	0	0	0

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF YEARLY RENT (\$0.00/SQ.FT.)
PAID BY BUSINESSES IN THE WEST END PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RETAIL	96	64	99	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	91	33	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	82	93	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING	41	23	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	12	29	840	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TOTAL PAYMENTS (MOVING AND SBDP, 100'S),
PAID TO BUSINESSES IN THE WEST END PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
RETAIL	9	9	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	2	2	-0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	5	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING	13	13	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	3	2	1	0	0	-0	0	0	0	0

NUMBER OF BUSINESSES RELOCATED* FROM THE
GOVERNMENT CENTER PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	9	50	22	2	2	1	0	88	10	
RETAIL	0	0	0	19	137	58	3	10	4	2	233	27	
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	1	8	33	13	3	4	1	0	63	7	
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	13	90	23	26	71	24	4	251	30	
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	7	99	16	0	1	3	0	126	15	
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	9	47	15	8	10	3	1	93	11	
TOTAL	0	0	1	65	456	147	42	98	36	7	852		

*Correction: DISLOCATED

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.)
OCCUPIED BY BUSINESSES IN THE GOVERNMENT CENTER PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	88	139	126	107	77	-0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	16	39	50	293	40	10	8
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	70	87	715	42	229	155	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	8	15	37	6	6	4	13
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	57	50	69	0	5	19	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	27	31	41	5	4	74	12

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED, IN THE
GOVERNMENT CENTER PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	15	9	11	6	11	-0	0
RETAIL	-0	-0	0	8	6	6	8	2	7	3
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	10	1	13	3	-0	2	0
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	4	5	8	3	3	1	2
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	10	11	17	0	-0	4	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	14	6	3	2	2	24	3

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF YEARLY RENT (\$0.00/SQ.FT.)
PAID BY BUSINESSES IN THE GOVERNMENT CENTER PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	124	83	92	70	81	0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	210	193	142	57	256	409	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	56	94	61	40	127	309	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	189	233	240	377	388	319	256
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	66	86	93	0	134	257	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	94	165	121	263	382	343	362

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TOTAL PAYMENTS (MOVING AND SBDP, 100'S),
PAID TO BUSINESSES IN THE GOVERNMENT CENTER PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	96	96	106	47	156	-0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	19	40	33	63	49	51	26
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	5	-0	19	8	96	61	-0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	6	14	11	17	13	26	-0
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	72	68	58	0	4	7	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	14	14	22	4	21	4	-0

NUMBER OF BUSINESSES RELOCATED* FROM THE
WASHINGTON PARK PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	3	0	0	14	5
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	38	38	19	2	1	98	35
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	2	3	0	14	5
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	29	29	14	1	2	75	27
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	4	0	0	16	6
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	20	29	10	5	0	64	23
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	1	97	117	52	11	3	281	

*Correction: DISLOCATED

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.)
OCCUPIED BY BUSINESSES IN THE WASHINGTON PARK PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	98	8	38	-0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	14	126	16
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	12	20	16	41	190	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	14	40	8
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	16	65	47	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	18	11	162	12	0

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED, IN THE
WASHINGTON PARK PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	0	0	12	8	2	-0	0
RETAIL	-0	-0	0	0	0	5	2	2	5	1
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	0	0	1	0	0	14	0
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	0	0	2	3	3	18	5
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	0	0	3	11	3	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	0	0	2	1	4	0	0

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF YEARLY RENT (\$0.00/SQ.FT.)
PAID BY BUSINESSES IN THE WASHINGTON PARK PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	185	50	18	0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	118	112	118	222	56
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	44	41	10	150	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	117	115	76	0	97
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	76	48	36	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	126	110	145	25	0

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TOTAL PAYMENTS (MOVING AND SBDP, 100'S),
PAID TO BUSINESSES IN THE WASHINGTON PARK PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	71	22	93	-0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	22	27	40	32	25
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	-0	0	18	4	4	-0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	16	36	27	176	25
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	16	54	21	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	44	9	-0

NUMBER OF BUSINESSES RELOCATED* FROM THE
WATERFRONT PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT											COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	26	29	7	73	41
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	11	3	23	13
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	6	1	12	6
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	12	2	21	12
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	12	2	33	19
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	7	1	17	10
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	65	77	16	179	

*Correction: DISLOCATED

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.)
OCCUPIED BY BUSINESSES IN THE WATERFRONT PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	73	97	106
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	82	55
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	201037	23	-0	
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	45	55	8
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	71	77	185
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	7	36	0

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED, IN THE
WATERFRONT PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	0	0	0	5	6	12	6
RETAIL	-0	-0	0	0	0	0	0	7	17	7
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	300	16	16	5
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	2	14	17	45
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	0	0	0	2	7	10	0

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF YEARLY RENT (\$0.00/SQ.FT.)
PAID BY BUSINESSES IN THE WATERFRONT PROJECT

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	89	66
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	216	120	85
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	125	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	0	240	127	222	211
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	106	126
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	300	63	0

**AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TOTAL PAYMENTS (MOVING AND SBDP,100'S);
PAID TO BUSINESSES IN THE WATERFRONT PROJECT**

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	66	74	25
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	31	48	17
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	-0	0	0	0	4	41	-0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	61	0
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	99	103	-0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	30	-0

NUMBER OF BUSINESSES RELOCATED*FROM THE
OTHER PROJECTS

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	1	8	2	1	7	3	22	8
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	1	60	13	5	35	14	128	46
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	0	4	2	17	6
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	2	13	3	1	10	4	33	12
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	3	12	2	0	13	6	36	13
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	1	18	4	2	10	4	39	14
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	8	122	24	9	79	33	275	

*Correction: DISLOCATED

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.)
OCCUPIED BY BUSINESSES IN THE OTHER PROJECTS

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	30	24	15	20	127	146
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	5	16	11	18	60	144
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	58	27
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	3	7	2	12	10	12
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	6	45	41	0	167	161
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	4	32	23	31	45	13

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED, IN THE
OTHER PROJECTS

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	0	2	4	2	6	6	24
RETAIL	-0	-0	0	0	1	2	3	2	5	11
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	0	0	1	0	0	4	9
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	0	1	1	1	2	4	3
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	0	3	9	3	0	12	9
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	0	1	2	1	1	6	7

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF YEARLY RENT (\$0.00/SQ.FT.).
PAID BY BUSINESSES IN THE OTHER PROJECTS

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	44	89	235	0	112	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	57	157	164	97	238	141
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	68	0	0	144	144
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	277	139	167	0	95	259
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	52	82	32	0	50	58
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	106	126	0	0	226	138

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TOTAL PAYMENTS (MOVING AND SBDP, 100'S),
PAID TO BUSINESSES IN THE OTHER PROJECTS

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	29	44	97	26	25
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	24	46	57	39	28
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	-0	0	2	0	0	127	25
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	3	4	10	104	24	26
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	42	95	0	60	24
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	4	20	25

APPENDIX II

SURVEY CHARACTERISTICS

Subject	Page
A. Analysis of the Survey by Type of Business	32
B. Analysis of the Survey by Size of Business - Over Time	33
C. A Check on Nonforwardables by Group Over Time	34
D. A Check on Nonforwardables - Reason for Survey Return	35

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY

BUSINESS TYPE	RELOC (1)	SURVEY N-DELIV (2)	(3)	LOAD (1-3)	SURVEY AS PCNT LOAD
WHOLESALE					
FOOD	43	15	2	41	36
OTHER	123	26	12	111	23
RETAIL					
HARDWARE, ETC.	38	6	8	30	20
DRYGOODS	41	3	10	31	9
FOOD	57	3	16	41	7
CLOTHING	42	5	4	38	13
APPLN., FURN.	46	7	7	39	17
EATING	29	6	4	25	24
DRINK, LIQUOR	35	2	11	24	8
OTHER	93	13	19	74	17
STORAGE, DISTRIB	98	5	22	76	6
FINANCE, R.E.	56	16	8	48	33
PERSONAL SERVICE					
OTHER	101	16	21	80	20
BARBER, BEAUTY	36	7	5	31	22
BUS. SERV, PROF.	203	48	14	189	25
NONPROFIT	76	9	6	70	12
ROOMING HOUSES	27	0	5	22	0
MANUFACTURING					
PRINTING	55	9	7	48	18
FOOD	6	3	1	5	60
FABRC, APPAREL	31	7	3	28	25
OTHER	120	27	10	110	24
UNKNOWN, OTHER	26	5	6	20	25
TOTAL	1382	238	201	1181	20

ANALYSIS OF SURVEY BY DATE OF MOVE

NO. EMPLOYEES		SURVEY RETURNS AS PERCENT OF ADJUSTED LOAD									
		58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
1 -	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	5	3	0
2 -	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	3	6	5
4 -	5	0	0	0	2	4	1	2	4	3	5
6 -	7	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	5	0
8 -	19	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	4	8	5
20 -	49	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	2	5	2
50 -	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
0 -	0	6	6	7	5	1	0	1	3	2	2
RELOC. LOAD (1)		56	81	22	48	370	262	158	185	163	37
NON-DELIVERY (2)		25	35	8	8	54	46	18	3	4	0
ADJ-LOAD (1)-(2)		31	46	14	40	316	216	140	182	159	37
TOT - PCNT RETURN		6	6	7	9	14	11	16	22	32	(21)

A CHECK ON NONFORWARDABLES BY GROUP OVER TIME

BUSINESS TYPE	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	
WHOLESALE	0	4	0	0	4	4	2	0	0	0	14
RETAIL	12	17	3	4	13	24	5	1	0	0	79
STORAGE, DISTRIB	3	0	2	1	5	8	1	0	2	0	22
SERVICES, PROF.	5	10	0	2	9	7	3	2	2	0	40
MANUFACTURING	5	2	0	1	11	1	1	0	0	0	21
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	2	3	0	12	2	6	0	0	0	25
TOTAL (T)	25	35	8	8	54	46	18	3	4	0	201
RELCC LOAD (R)	90	102	22	62	333	270	159	185	166	41	
PERCENTAGE T/R	27	34	36	12	14	17	11	1	2	0	

A CHECK ON NONFORWARDABLES BY GROUP.

BUSINESS TYPE	REASON FOR RETURN *								TOT
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
WHOLESALE	7	1	0	2	2	0	1	1	14
RETAIL	32	10	5	14	7	5	6	0	79
STORAGE, DISTRIB	11	2	1	3	4	1	0	0	22
SERVICES, PROF.	17	6	3	8	2	0	2	2	40
MANUFACTURING	11	4	0	1	3	0	2	0	21
OTHER, UNKNOWN	11	4	1	2	4	2	1	0	25
TOTAL	89	27	10	30	22	8	12	3	201

*REASONS:

1. Address unknown
2. Moved and left no forwarding address
3. Insufficient address
4. Addressee Unknown
5. No such street
6. Other
7. Not forwardable
8. Unclaimed

APPENDIX III

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE FIRMS PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

Subject	Page
A. All Firms	36 - 47
1. Magnitude of Displacement	
2. Total Amount of Building Space Removed from Market	
3. Total Amount of Building Space (Row Percentages)	
4. Total Number of Employees Affected	
5. Total Number of Employees Affected (Row Percentages)	
6. Relocation Load by 22 Business Types	
7. Size (Space) of Business by 22 Business Types	
8. Size (Space) of Business Over Time	
9. Size (Employees) of Business by 22 Business Types	
10. Size (Employees) of Business Over Time	
11. Rentals versus Size of Business by Employees	
12. Rentals Over Time	
B. Liquidated Firms	48 - 58
1. Liquidations by 22 Types of Business Over Time	
2. Liquidations by 6 Types of Business Over Time	
3. Liquidations by Number of Employees Over Time	
4. Reasons for Liquidations	
5. Total Amount of Floor Space Occupies	
6. Average Amount of Floor Space Occupied	
7. Total Number of Employees Displaced	
8. Average Number of Employees Displaced	
9. Average Amount of Rent Paid	
10. Average Amount of Total Payments	
11. Percentage Liquidations by Rentals versus Employees	

C.	Wholesale Businesses	59 - 63
	1. Size by Space Occupies Over Time	
	2. Size by Number of Employees - Over Time	
	3. Rentals - Over Time	
	4. Rentals versus Size of Firm by Employees	
	5. Reason for Liquidation - Over Time	
D.	Retail Businesses	64 - 68
E.	Storage and Distribution Firms	69 - 73
F.	Service and Professional Firms	74 - 78
G.	Manufacturing Businesses	79 - 83
H.	Other Businesses	84 - 88

MAGNITUDE OF DISPLACEMENTBOSTON FIRMS

BUSINESS TYPE	FIRMS (1958-67)	COL-PCNT	BRA EST. DISPL (1967-72)	TOTAL (1958-72)	BOSTON TOT. 1963	PCNT DISPL of BOSTON TOT.
WHOLESALE	203	10.7	286	489	3225	15.2
RETAIL	630	33.2	684	1314	5185	25.3
STORAGE, DISTRIB.	130	6.8	---	---	---	---
SERVICES, PROF.	435	22.9	448	883	6036	14.6
MANUFACTURING	237	12.5	268	505	2087	24.2
OTHER, UNKNOWN	265	13.9	---	---	---	---
	<u>1900</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>1686</u>	<u>3191</u>	<u>16,533</u>	

A-36

MAGNITUDE OF DISPLACEMENTBOSTON EMPLOYEES

BUSINESS TYPE	EMPLOYEES (1958-67)	BRA EST. DISPL (1967-72)	TOTAL (1958-72)	BOSTON TOT. 1963	PCNT DISPL of BOSTON TOT.
WHOLESALE	1541	2586	4127	71,906	5.7
RETAIL	2242	2556	4798	42,275	11.3
SERVICES, PROF.	1819	1976	3795	55,008	6.9
MANUFACTURING	2239	6006	8245	80,127	10.3

TOTAL AMOUNT OF BUILDING SPACE
REMOVED FROM THE MARKET (1000'S OF SQ. FT.)

BUSINESS TYPE	58	59	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT				64	65	66	67	TOT	COL PCNT
			60	61	62	63						
WHOLESALE	0	20	0	61	644	261	69	209	362	97	1723	25.6
RETAIL	49	41	15	22	408	363	147	87	271	206	1609	23.9
STORAGE, DISTRIB	6	16	1	35	149	523	15	261	104	5	1115	16.6
SERVICES, PROF.	5	20	2	8	119	119	73	90	75	10	521	7.7
MANUFACTURING	19	10	12	22	455	164	69	112	242	85	1190	17.7
OTHER, UNKNOWN	14	48	4	8	112	119	55	141	68	2	571	8.5
TOTAL	93	155	34	156	1887	1549	428	900	1122	405	6729	
ROW PCNT	1.4	2.3	.1	2.3	28.0	23.0	6.4	13.4	16.7	6.0	100.0	

THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF BUILDING SPACE
REMOVED FROM THE MARKET (ROW PERCENTAGES)

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	1	0	3	37	15	4	12	21	5
RETAIL	3	2	0	1	25	22	9	5	16	12
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	1	0	3	13	46	1	23	9	0
SERVICES, PROF.	1	3	0	1	22	22	13	17	14	2
MANUFACTURING	1	0	1	1	38	13	5	9	20	7
OTHER, UNKNOWN	2	8	0	1	19	20	9	24	11	0

TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AFFECTED BY DISLOCATION

BUSINESS TYPE	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	COL-PCNT %
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	90	427	256	72	200	392	104	1541	17.9
RETAIL	-0	-0	5	90	648	681	140	141	353	184	2242	26.0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	10	14	57	3	3	68	20	175	2.0
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	42	413	231	477	329	290	37	1819	21.0
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	40	1012	360	98	219	371	139	2239	26.0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	43	173	93	49	89	141	17	605	7.0
TOTAL	-0	-0	5	315	2687	1678	839	981	1615	501	8621	100.0
ROW PCNT	-	-	-	3.7	31.2	19.5	9.7	11.4	18.7	5.8		

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES
AFFECTED BY DISLOCATION. (ROW PERCENTAGES)

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	-0	0	5	27	16	4	12	25	6
RETAIL	-0	-0	0	4	28	30	6	6	15	8
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	-0	5	8	32	1	1	38	11
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	2	22	12	26	18	15	2
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	-0	1	45	16	4	9	16	6
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	7	28	15	8	14	23	2

TYPE OF BUSINESS RELOCATION LOAD OVER TIME

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE										
FOOD	0	1	0	0	4	7	13	15	18	6
OTHER	0	7	0	9	47	27	9	17	19	4
RETAIL										
HARDWARE, ETC.	10	6	1	0	10	12	5	3	0	3
DRYGOODS	13	4	0	4	17	15	8	8	3	2
FOOD	22	16	5	3	9	27	8	6	5	2
CLOTHING	7	4	2	1	19	17	2	1	8	2
APPLN., FURN.	2	3	2	0	19	11	4	3	7	1
EATING	4	6	1	5	18	17	7	7	8	3
DRINK, LIQUOR	5	5	4	4	26	21	4	5	6	3
OTHER	10	15	0	3	20	36	18	8	15	4
STORAGE, DISTRIB	13	9	3	8	34	27	10	9	14	3
FINANCE, R.E.	2	2	1	0	12	11	11	16	7	1
PERSONAL SERVICE										
OTHER	12	16	1	6	38	30	18	16	8	2
BARBER, BEAUTY	6	6	2	1	17	15	9	3	2	4
BUS. SERV, PROF.	4	6	2	6	37	20	33	72	37	6
NONPROFIT	4	6	4	4	17	20	18	10	7	3
ROOMING HOUSES	6	15	6	0	8	22	11	0	3	0
MANUFACTURING										
PRINTING	0	5	0	3	32	6	0	5	8	1
FOOD	2	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	1
FABRIC, APPAREL	3	0	1	1	15	8	0	0	6	1
OTHER	10	4	1	3	54	15	12	17	13	5
UNKNOWN, OTHER	2	3	0	5	11	1	4	2	8	2
TOTAL	137	139	36	66	465	367	204	224	203	59
ROW PCNT	7.2	7.3	1.9	3.5	24.5	19.3	10.7	11.8	10.7	3.1

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

BUSINESS TYPE

AREA IN SQ.FT.

	UNDER 500-	500-0.9K	1K-2.9K	3K-4.9K	5K-9.9K	10K-20K	20K+	UN- KNOWN
WHOLESALE								
FOOD	2	7	16	9	10	6	7	7
OTHER	5	10	30	14	22	23	17	18
RETAIL								
HARDWARE, ETC.	4	7	9	6	6	3	4	11
DRYGOODS	14	20	16	3	3	2	3	13
FOOD	10	18	39	2	2	2	2	28
CLOTHING	9	7	20	5	2	1	0	19
APPLN., FURN.	3	4	9	9	5	7	3	12
EATING	10	12	32	5	5	0	0	12
DRINK, LIQUOR	1	11	35	8	2	1	1	24
OTHER	22	23	31	8	9	1	4	31
STORAGE, DISTRIB	7	12	21	9	13	7	8	53
FINANCE, R.E.	20	10	14	2	5	1	1	10
PERSONAL SERVICE								
OTHER	28	33	40	9	3	1	1	32
BARBER, BEAUTY	37	15	7	1	1	0	0	4
BUS. SERV, PROF.	86	40	51	7	7	3	2	27
NONPROFIT	16	8	19	7	9	0	3	31
ROOMING HOUSES	0	1	15	14	6	3	1	31
MANUFACTURING								
PRINTING	4	6	15	10	13	2	2	8
FOOD	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	2
FABRIC, APPAREL	1	1	12	2	9	2	1	7
OTHER	4	14	30	20	24	8	11	23
UNKNOWN, OTHER	1	3	6	3	1	0	0	24
TOTAL	284	262	471	153	157	75	71	427
ROW PCNT	19.3	17.8	32.0	10.4	10.7	5.1	4.8	-

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
FOR ALL BUSINESS FIRMS.

AREA IN SQ.FT.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
UNDER 50	(14)	13	(6)	(11)	61	55	43	(52)	26	3	284	19	
500 - 999	12	(14)	2	5	(49)	(58)	(51)	38	(23)	(10)	262	17	
1,000 - 2,999	24	28	8	9	113	124	53	56	41	15	471	31	
3,000 - 4,999	1	16	2	8	57	26	14	15	12	2	153	10	
5,000 - 9,999	4	0	0	7	54	28	8	19	32	5	157	10	
10,000 - 19,999	0	4	1	1	24	11	2	11	18	3	75	5	
OVER 20,000	1	0	0	1	20	14	6	8	15	6	71	4	
0, UNKNOWN	81	64	17	24	87	51	27	25	36	15	427	0	
TOTAL	137	139	36	66	465	367	204	224	203	59	1900	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	56	75	19	42	378	316	177	199	167	44			

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY EMPLOYEES PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

BUSINESS TYPE	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	0, OR X
WHOLESALE								
FOOD	8	13	6	7	15	4	1	10
OTHER	18	21	21	15	23	11	4	26
RETAIL								
HARDWARE, ETC.	9	7	5	0	7	4	0	18
DRYGOODS	20	14	8	1	2	2	0	27
FOOD	15	20	6	3	7	1	0	51
CLOTHING	11	21	10	1	2	0	1	17
APPLN., FURN.	8	14	4	2	4	1	0	19
EATING	7	22	9	5	10	0	2	21
DRINK, LIQUOR	5	24	17	7	2	2	2	24
OTHER	35	28	13	4	4	2	1	42
STORAGE, DISTRIB	17	11	1	2	3	2	0	94
FINANCE, R.E.	11	18	10	5	3	3	0	13
PERSONAL SERVICE								
OTHER	45	35	11	3	5	4	1	43
BARBER, BEAUTY	21	21	5	2	0	0	0	16
BUS. SERV, PROF.	30	50	16	8	16	8	4	41
NONPROFIT	15	19	4	2	3	2	0	48
ROOMING HOUSES	12	4	3	1	1	1	0	49
MANUFACTURING								
PRINTING	12	10	4	5	11	4	3	11
FOOD	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	2
FABRIC, APPAREL	3	2	2	3	8	8	3	6
OTHER	12	27	17	10	21	13	2	32
UNKNOWN, OTHER	4	5	2	1	1	1	0	24
TOTAL	369	389	175	87	148	74	24	634
ROW PCNT	29.1	30.7	13.8	6.9	11.7	5.8	1.9	-

SIZE OF ALL BUSINESS FIRMS
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

NO. EMPLOYEES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT COL-PONT	TOT. UNIQ.	PCNT. UNIQ.	
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67				
ONE	0	0	0	11	75	114	60	63	34	12	369	29	98	26
2 TO 3	0	0	0	9	102	95	65	54	52	12	389	30	97	24
4 TO 5	0	0	1	3	68	36	14	27	18	8	175	13	35	20
6 TO 7	0	0	0	2	33	15	11	11	12	3	87	6	18	20
8 TO 19	0	0	0	3	46	25	6	23	33	12	148	11	17	11
20 TO 49	0	0	0	6	26	10	2	10	18	2	74	5	4	5
50+ OVER	0	0	0	1	6	5	2	1	6	3	24	1	0	0
0, UNKNOWN	137	139	35	31	109	67	44	35	30	7	634	0	151	23
TOTAL	137	139	36	66	465	367	204	224	203	59	1900	100	420	27

ADJUSTED TOTAL - 6 - 35 356 300 160 189 173 52 1266

RENTALS, PRICED TO DISPLACEMENT,
VERSUS SIZE FOR ALL BUSINESS FIRMS.

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES										0, 19	20- 49	50+ OVER OR X	TOT COL-PCNT	TOT-LIQ.	PCNT-LIQ
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+ OVER OR X									
0.00 - 0.11	4	2	1	5	2	0	0	14	28	1	11	39				
0.12 - 0.24	5	12	6	2	5	4	0	77	111	7	27	24				
0.25 - 0.49	28	37	22	11	21	17	6	94	236	15	44	18				
0.50 - 0.74	47	56	25	16	17	(9)	(4)	61	235	15	55	23				
0.75 - 0.99	29	32	13	(5)	(14)	10	2	53	158	10	30	18				
1.00 - 1.49	(41)	(50)	(20)	11	17	3	1	55	198	13	47	23				
1.50 - 2.99	61	82	31	11	26	5	3	41	260	17	61	23				
3.00 - 9.99	82	64	34	14	12	6	1	51	264	17	46	17				
UNKNOWN	72	54	23	12	34	20	7	188	410	0	99	24				
TOTAL	369	389	175	87	148	74	24	634	1900	100	420	22				
ADJUSTED TOTAL	297	335	152	75	114	54	17	-	-	-	-	-				

RENTS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY ALL BUSINESS FIRMS

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT														TOT COL-PCT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	
0.00 - 0.11	3	6	1	0	3	6	5	3	1	0	28				1
0.12 - 0.24	31	27	4	3	17	13	5	6	4	1	111				7
0.25 - 0.49	25	30	5	8	60	45	24	19	15	5	236				15
0.50 - 0.74	(17)	(16)	3	7	81	55	22	11	20	3	235				15
0.75 - 0.99	13	17	(6)	(4)	(45)	(34)	17	10	10	2	158				10
1.00 - 1.49	8	9	4	5	74	46	(18)	14	(12)	(8)	198				13
1.50 - 2.99	10	5	6	11	71	59	39	(23)	27	9	260				17
3.00 - 9.99	7	2	4	6	69	36	27	76	34	3	264				17
UNKNCKN	23	27	3	22	45	73	47	62	80	28	410				0.
TOTAL	137	139	36	66	465	367	204	224	203	59	1900				100

ADJUSTED TOTAL 114 112 33 44 420 294 157 162 123 31

TYPE OF BUSINESS LIQUIDATION LOAD OVER TIME

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE										
FOOD	0	0	0	0	1	1	6	9	2	2
OTHER	0	0	0	1	7	3	0	0	2	0
RETAIL										
HARDWARE, ETC.	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2
DRYGOODS	5	2	0	0	5	5	2	3	0	2
FOOD	9	5	3	0	2	9	3	4	1	1
CLOTHING	4	1	0	0	7	5	1	0	2	1
APPLN., FURN.	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0
EATING	2	3	1	1	7	12	4	6	7	2
DRINK, LIQUOR	3	2	2	2	12	11	3	4	5	3
OTHER	4	1	0	0	4	6	2	2	7	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	0	1	0
FINANCE, R.E.	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0
PERSONAL SERVICE										
OTHER	4	4	1	0	7	12	4	5	1	1
BARBER, BEAUTY	1	2	2	0	10	4	3	2	0	3
BUS. SERV, PROF.	0	0	0	0	2	1	6	1	4	0
NONPROFIT	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
ROOMING HOUSES	4	7	5	0	5	15	5	0	1	0
MANUFACTURING										
PRINTING	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0
FOOD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
FABRIC, APPAREL	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
OTHER	1	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	0	1
UNKNOWN, OTHER	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
TOTAL	47	37	14	4	82	97	45	39	37	18

LIQUIDATION BY BUSINESS, OVER TIME

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	1	8	4	6	9	4	2	34
RETAIL	28	14	6	3	40	51	15	19	23	11	210
STORAGE, DISTRIB	5	4	0	0	2	5	1	0	1	0	18
SERVICES, PROF.	5	6	3	0	19	17	13	8	5	4	80
MANUFACTURING	1	1	0	0	7	3	1	1	1	1	16
OTHER, UNKNOWN	8	12	5	0	6	17	9	2	3	0	62
TOTAL ¹	47	37	14	4	82	97	45	39	37	18	420
TOTAL LOAD ¹	103	118	36	52	452	359	203	224	200	55	1802
PERCENTAGE LIQD.	45	31	38	7	18	27	22	17	18	32	23

¹Less unknowns and prior move-outs.
See Appendix, p. 51.

LIQUIDATIONS BY SIZE FOR ALL BUSINESS FIRMS.
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

NO. EMPLOYEES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT. COU-PCNT	TOT. ROAD	PCNT. LIQ.
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT				
ONE	0	0	0	0	18	34	19	11	9	7	98	36	369	26	
2 TO 3	0	0	0	0	18	30	14	19	13	3	97	36	389	24	
4 TO 5	0	0	0	1	14	10	0	5	3	2	35	13	175	20	
6 TO 7	0	0	0	0	10	3	2	0	1	2	18	6	87	20	
8 TO 19	0	0	0	1	3	4	2	2	2	3	17	6	148	11	
20 TO 49	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	74	5	
50+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	0	
0, UNKNOWN	47	37	14	1	17	15	8	2	9	1	151	0	634	20	
TOTAL	47	37	14	4	82	97	45	39	37	18	420	100	1900	22	

REASON FOR LIQUIDATION .VS. DATE OF DISPLACEMENT
FOR ALL BUSINESS FIRMS

REASON FOR LIQD.	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT										LESS ¹ 58-60 COL-PCNT	
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT COL-PCNT	
RETIREMENT	0	0	0	0	24	40	23	19	17	11	134	31
LIQUOR LICENSE	0	0	0	2	12	11	2	5	4	4	40	9
OTHER LICENSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
TO RE-ESTABLISH	0	0	0	0	8	16	11	7	6	1	49	11
NOT DUE TO DISPL	0	0	0	0	8	6	0	1	6	0	21	5
CCNSOLIDATION	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	5	1
DUE TO DISPL.	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	0
SPACE UNAVAIL.	0	0	0	1	18	17	2	1	2	1	42	10
OTHER	47	37	14	0	9	4	7	5	0	1	124	29
PRICR MOVE-OUT	4	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	2	4	(19)	0
UNKNKCWN	30	21	0	8	10	8	1	0	1	0	(79)	0
TOTAL	81	58	14	18	95	105	46	39	40	22	518	
PCNT UNKNOWNNS	37	36	-	43	11	8	2	-	3	0	(420) ²	

¹Data unavailable prior to 61.

²Total liquidations-- 518 less unknowns and move-outs.

THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (1000'S OF SQ.FT.)
OCCUPIED BY LIQUIDATED BUSINESS FIRMS.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	-0	66	3	12	31	31	8	151
RETAIL	11	8	7	5	83	75	15	26	38	25	293
STORAGE, DISTRIB	5	15	0	0	9	490	0	0	0	0	519
SERVICES, PROF.	1	4	1	0	12	23	9	6	1	4	61
MANUFACTURING	1	-0	0	0	20	27	16	1	-0	39	104
OTHER, UNKNOWN	7	26	-0	0	45	43	11	0	8	0	140
TOTAL	25	53	8	5	235	661	63	64	78	76	1268

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF FLOOR SPACE (100'S OF SQ.FT.)
OCCUPIED BY LIQUIDATED BUSINESS FIRMS.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	-0	95	17	31	34	78	43
RETAIL	9	10	15	27	25	17	10	16	21	25
STORAGE, DISTRIB	26	76	0	0	90	1225	9	0	2	0
SERVICES, PRCF.	12	10	5	0	7	14	8	8	4	14
MANUFACTURING	10	-0	0	0	34	91	160	12	-0	394
OTHER, UNKNOWN	70	37	-0	0	90	28	16	2	80	0

THE TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED
FROM LIQUIDATED BUSINESS FIRMS.

BUSINESS TYPE	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	COL PCNT
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	-0	28	10	18	22	16	6	100	11
RETAIL	-0	-0	-0	34	146	121	28	57	52	35	473	53
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	0	0	-0	52	-0	0	3	0	55	6
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	0	46	27	19	13	11	12	128	14
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	0	0	18	18	11	2	5	10	64	7
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	0	36	19	10	1	-0	0	66	7
TOTAL	-0	-0	-0	34	274	247	86	95	87	63	886	

AVERAGE NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES DISPLACED
FROM LIQUIDATED BUSINESS FIRMS.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	-0	3	2	6	2	5	3
RETAIL	-0	-0	-0	11	4	2	1	3	2	3
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-0	-0	0	0	-0	13	-0	0	3	0
SERVICES, PROF.	-0	-0	-0	0	2	1	1	1	2	4
MANUFACTURING	-0	-0	0	0	3	6	11	2	5	10
OTHER, UNKNOWN	-0	-0	-0	0	12	1	1	1	-0	0

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF RENT PAID BY LIQUIDATED BUSINESS FIRMS.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	59	142	0	0	368	117
RETAIL	75	54	78	247	248	127	136	145	276	109
STORAGE, DISTRIB	112	33	0	0	53	56	0	0	150	0
SERVICES, PROF.	150	108	83	0	268	89	235	201	264	259
MANUFACTURING	69	0	0	0	49	80	22	75	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	6	35	0	0	50	60	139	362	0	0

AVERAGE AMOUNT OF TOTAL PAYMENTS (MOVING AND SBOP, 100'S),
PAID TO LIQUIDATED BUSINESSES.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT									
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	-0	22	10	-0	24	26	25
RETAIL	8	8	10	20	16	17	22	36	34	24
STORAGE, DISTRIB	3	-0	0	0	-0	19	7	0	27	0
SERVICES, PROF.	22	10	3	0	10	16	13	19	40	26
MANUFACTURING	-0	8	0	0	23	11	45	6	17	25
OTHER, UNKNOWN	3	2	1	0	13	8	18	-0	-0	0

PERCENTAGE LIQUIDATIONS BY RENTALS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT,
VERSUS SIZE FOR ALL BUSINESS FIRMS.

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+ OVER	0, OR X
0.00 - 0.11	75	50	100	20	50	0	0	28
0.12 - 0.24	60	33	16	50	20	0	0	22
0.25 - 0.49	17	10	18	18	4	11	0	27
0.50 - 0.74	27	25	16	12	0	0	0	36
0.75 - 0.99	31	18	7	20	7	20	0	18
1.00 - 1.49	26	34	25	9	11	0	0	20
1.50 - 2.99	14	34	29	18	19	0	0	19
3.00 - 9.99	17	14	17	35	8	0	0	21
UNKNOWN	43	25	17	25	14	0	0	22

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY WHOLESALE BUSINESS FIRMS.

AREA IN SQ.FT.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
UNDER 500	0	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	7		3
500 - 999	0	0	0	1	1	5	5	3	2	0	17		9
1,000 - 2,999	0	(2)	0	(2)	13	5	(7)	8	7	2	46		25
3,000 - 4,999	0	1	0	0	(6)	(4)	0	(5)	(7)	0	23		12
5,000 - 9,999	0	0	0	2	8	5	3	7	4	3	32		17
10,000 - 19,999	0	1	0	0	9	3	1	5	9	1	29		16
OVER 20,000	0	0	0	1	8	4	1	2	6	2	24		13
0, UNKNOWN	0	4	0	2	4	6	3	2	2	2	25		0
TOTAL	0	8	0	9	51	34	22	32	37	10	203		100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	4	0	7	47	28	19	29	35	8			

SIZE OF WHOLESALE
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

BUSINESSES

NO. EMPLOYEES

DATE OF DISPLACEMENT

58 59 60 61 62 63 64

65 66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79 80 81 82 83 84 85 86 87 88 89 90 91 92 93 94 95 96 97 98 99 100

TOT. COE-PCNT

TOT. LIQ.

PCNT. LIQ.

ONE

2 TO 3

4 TO 5

6 TO 7

8 TO 19

20 TO 49

50+, CVER

0, UNKNOWN

TOTAL

ADJUSTED TOTAL

ONE	0	0	0	3	6	5	3	5	4	0	26	15	9	34
2 TO 3	0	0	0	0	8	6	3	7	7	3	34	20	9	24
4 TO 5	0	0	0	1	11	4	2	5	2	2	27	16	5	18
6 TO 7	0	0	0	0	6	3	4	6	3	0	22	13	3	12
8 TO 19	0	0	0	0	8	6	2	7	13	2	38	22	3	7
20 TO 49	0	0	0	1	6	2	0	2	4	0	15	8	0	0
50+, CVER	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5	2	0	0
0, UNKNOWN	0	8	0	3	5	7	8	0	3	2	36	0	5	12
TOTAL	0	8	0	9	51	34	22	32	37	10	203	100	34	16
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	0	0	6	46	37	14	32	34	8	267			

RENTS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY WHOLESALE BUSINESS FIRMS

DOLLARS/SQ. FT.	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT COL-PCNT
0.00 - 0.11	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	6
0.12 - 0.24	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	2	1	1	13
0.25 - 0.49	0	(2)	0	(3)	(15)	3	2	(7)	6	1	39
0.50 - 0.74	0	1	0	0	10	(9)	(2)	2	(8)	(2)	34
0.75 - 0.99	0	2	0	0	5	3	3	2	3	0	18
1.00 - 1.49	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	2	2	0	13
1.50 - 2.99	0	0	0	1	8	2	1	1	2	1	16
3.00 - 9.99	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	2	0	11
UNKNOWN	0	0	0	2	0	5	13	16	12	5	53
TOTAL	0	8	0	9	51	34	22	32	37	10	203
ADJ TOTAL	0	8	0	7	51	29	9	16	25	5	

100

LIQUIDATIONS BY WHOLESALE	FIRMS	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
		58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
REASON FOR LIQD.														
RETIREMENT		0	0	0	0	4	2	5	8	2	1	22	64	
LIQUOR LICENSE		0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	
OTHER LICENSE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TO RE-ESTABLISH		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	
NOT DUE TO DISPL		0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	5	14	
CONSOLIDATION		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DUE TO DISPL.		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SPACE UNAVAIL.		0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	
OTHER		0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3	8	
PRIOR MOVE-OUT		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	
UNKNOWN		0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	
TOTAL		0	1	0	2	8	4	6	9	5	2	37	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL..		-0	-0	-0	1	8	4	6	9	4	2			
(LESS UNKNOWN AND MCVE-OUTS)														
TOTAL LOAD		-0	7	-0	8	51	34	22	32	36	10			
(LESS UNKNOWN AND MCVE-OUTS)														
ADJ. TOT./LOAD		-0	-0	-0	12	15	11	27	28	11	20			

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY RETAIL BUSINESS FIRMS.

AREA IN SQ.FT.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT														TOT COL-PGNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	
UNDER 500	12	5	1	3	13	16	9	5	7	2	73	15			
500 - 999	(7)	(8)	1	1	14	31	(17)	11	6	6	102	21			
1,000 - 2,999	15	16	(7)	(6)	(34)	(61)	18	(16)	(13)	(5)	191	39			
3,000 - 4,999	0	1	1	3	19	11	6	1	2	2	46	9			
5,000 - 9,999	0	0	0	0	13	10	0	3	8	0	34	7			
10,000 - 19,999	0	1	0	0	7	3	0	2	3	1	17	3			
OVER 20,000	1	0	0	0	4	4	2	0	4	2	17	3			
0, UNKNOWN	38	28	5	7	34	20	4	3	9	2	150	0			
TOTAL	73	59	15	20	138	156	56	41	52	20	630	100			
ADJUSTED TOTAL	35	31	10	13	103	136	52	38	43	18					

SIZE OF RETAIL
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

BUSINESSES

NO. EMPLOYEES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT. COL-PCNT	TOT. LIQ.	PCNT. LIQ.
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
ONE	0	0	0	0	19	45	21	10	8	7	110	40	36
2 TO 3	0	0	0	5	(29)	(51)	(23)	(19)	(19)	(4)	150	58	38
4 TO 5	0	0	1	(2)	26	21	7	8	5	2	72	21	29
6 TO 7	0	0	0	1	12	6	0	0	2	2	23	10	42
8 TO 19	0	0	0	1	13	11	2	1	7	3	38	9	22
20 TO 49	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	1	2	1	12	2	16
50+, OVER	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	0	2	1	6	0	0
0, UNKNOWN	73	59	14	9	35	17	3	2	7	0	219	70	37
TOTAL	73	59	15	20	138	156	56	41	52	20	630	240	33
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	0	1	11	103	139	53	39	45	20			

RENTS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY RETAIL BUSINESS FIRMS

DOLLARS/SQ. FT.	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
0.00 - 0.11	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	0
0.12 - 0.24	15	9	1	1	5	4	0	1	0	0	36	6
0.25 - 0.49	(15)	(15)	3	3	10	19	7	4	2	3	81	15
0.50 - 0.74	11	7	1	0	27	22	9	4	7	1	89	17
0.75 - 0.99	6	9	(3)	(2)	10	18	3	3	3	0	57	10
1.00 - 1.49	7	7	2	1	(23)	(21)	(11)	(8)	2	(4)	86	16
1.50 - 2.99	4	1	3	3	19	33	16	6	(9)	3	97	18
3.00 - 9.99	4	0	2	2	30	15	1	6	12	0	72	13
UNKNOWN	11	8	0	8	14	23	8	9	17	9	107	0
TOTAL	73	59	15	20	138	156	56	41	52	20	630	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	62	51	15	12	124	133	48	32	35	11		

A-67

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES								TOT COL-PCNT	TOT-LIQ.	PCNT-LIQ	
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	0, OR X				
0.00 - 0.11	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	5	0	3	60
0.12 - 0.24	1	3	3	0	1	1	0	27	36	6	10	27
0.25 - 0.49	13	12	3	1	7	2	1	42	81	15	22	27
0.50 - 0.74	18	25	8	3	5	0	2	28	89	17	28	31
0.75 - 0.99	12	14	7	0	2	3	0	19	57	10	12	21
1.00 - 1.49	15	27	10	3	7	1	0	23	86	16	33	38
1.50 - 2.99	15	36	17	5	9	1	0	14	97	18	35	36
3.00 - 9.99	12	16	16	8	5	0	1	14	72	13	27	37
UNKNOWN	23	17	7	3	2	4	2	49	107	0	40	37
TOTAL	110	150	72	23	38	12	6	219	630	100	210	33

LIQUIDATIONS BY RETAIL		FIRMS	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCT	LESS (58-60) COL PCNT
REASON FOR LIQD.			58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67				
RETIREMENT			0	0	0	0	7	15	4	7	9	6	48	22	30	
LIQUOR LICENSE			0	0	0	2	11	10	2	5	4	4	38	18	23	
OTHER LICENSE			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	
TO RE-ESTABLISH			0	0	0	0	5	9	5	5	4	0	28	13	17	
NOT DUE TO DISPL			0	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	3	0	9	4	6	
CONSOLIDATION			0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	
DUE TO DISPL.			0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	
SPACE UNAVAIL.			0	0	0	0	8	10	2	1	2	1	24	11	15	
OTHER			28	14	6	0	5	2	2	0	0	0	57	27	6	
PRIOR MOVE-OUT			1	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	-	
UNKNOWN			16	7	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	31	0	-	
TOTAL			45	21	6	10	46	52	15	19	23	12	249	100	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL..			28	14	6	3	40	51	15	19	23	11				
(LESS UNKNOWNNS AND MCVE-OUTS)																
TOTAL LOAD			56	52	15	13	132	155	56	41	52	19				
(LESS UNKNOWNNS AND MCVE-OUTS)																
ADJ. TOT./LOAD			50	26	40	23	30	32	26	46	44	57				

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY STORAGE, DISTRIB BUSINESS FIRMS.

AREA IN SQ.FT.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	
UNDER 500	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	3	0	7	9	
500 - 999	0	1	0	0	1	6	2	0	1	(1)	12	15	
1,000 - 2,999	(2)	(1)	(1)	0	6	(5)	(2)	1	(3)	0	21	27	
3,000 - 4,999	1	0	0	2	(3)	1	1	0	1	0	9	11	
5,000 - 9,999	0	0	0	(2)	4	1	1	(2)	2	1	13	16	
10,000 - 19,999	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	0	2	0	7	9	
OVER 20,000	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	3	1	0	8	10	
0, UNKNOWN	10	6	2	3	16	7	4	3	1	1	53	0	
TOTAL	13	9	3	8	34	27	10	9	14	3	130	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	3	3	1	5	18	20	6	6	13	2			

SIZE OF STORAGE, DISTRIB BUSINESSES
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

NO. EMPLOYEES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT. COL-PCNT	TOT. REQ.	PCNT. LIR.
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68			
ONE	0	0	0	0	(4)	(6)	0	(1)	5	1	17	47	1	5
2 TO 3	0	0	0	0	4	1	(1)	1	(4)	0	11	30	2	18
4 TO 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(1)	1	2	0	0
6 TO 7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	5	0	0
8 TO 19	0	0	0	(1)	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	8	1	32
20 TO 49	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	5	1	50
50+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0, UNKNOWN	13	9	3	7	26	18	9	7	2	0	94	0	13	13
TOTAL	13	9	3	8	34	27	10	9	14	3	130	100	18	13
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	0	0	1	8	9	1	2	12	3				

RENTS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY STORAGE, DISTRIB BUSINESS FIRMS

DOLLARS/SQ. FT.	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT COL-PGNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
0.00 - 0.11	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	4	4
0.12 - 0.24	3	1	(1)	0	3	3	0	1	0	0	12	13
0.25 - 0.49	(1)	(3)	0	1	2	5	(5)	(2)	2	0	21	22
0.50 - 0.74	2	2	0	(1)	(5)	(6)	0	0	0	0	16	17
0.75 - 0.99	1	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	0	0	7	7
1.00 - 1.49	0	0	0	1	6	6	0	1	(2)	1	17	18
1.50 - 2.99	2	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	4	0	11	11
3.00 - 9.99	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	4	4
UNKNOWN	2	2	1	4	9	4	5	4	5	2	38	0
TOTAL	13	9	3	8	34	27	10	9	14	3	130	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	11	7	2	4	25	23	5	5	9	1		

RENTALS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT, VERSUS SIZE OF FIRM
FOR STORAGE, DISTRIB BUSINESS FIRMS.

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							0, 19 49 OVER OR X	TOT COL-PCNT TOT-LIQ.	PCNT-LIQ
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+ OVER			
0.00 - 0.11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	4	2 50
0.12 - 0.24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	13 0 0
0.25 - 0.49	2	2	0	0	0	1	0	16	21	22 4 19
0.50 - 0.74	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	10	16	17 6 37
0.75 - 0.99	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	7 0 0
1.00 - 1.49	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	17	18 1 5
1.50 - 2.99	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	6	11	11 2 18
3.00 - 9.99	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4 0 0
UNKNOWN	3	1	0	1	2	1	0	30	38	0 3 7
TOTAL	17	11	1	2	3	2	0	94	130	100 18 13

LIQUIDATIONS BY
STORAGE, DISTRIB FIRMS

REASON FOR LIQD.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT											TOT COL-PCT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
RETIREMENT	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3	16
LIQUOR LICENSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER LICENSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TO RE-ESTABLISH	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	11
NOT DUE TO DISPL	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
CONSOLIDATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DUE TO DISPL.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
SPACE UNAVAIL.	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	5
OTHER	5	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	10	55
PRIOR MOVE-OUT	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0
UNKNOWN	4	5	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	12	0
TOTAL	10	9	0	2	3	6	1	0	1	0	32	100

ADJUSTED TOTAL.. 5 4 -0 -0 2 5 1 -0 1 -0
(LESS UNKNOWN
AND MOVE-OUTS)

TOTAL LOAD 8 4 3 6 33 26 10 9 14 3
(LESS UNKNOWN
AND MOVE-OUTS)

ADJ. TOT./LOAD 62 100 -0 -0 6 19 10 -0 7 -0

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY SERVICES, PROF. BUSINESS FIRMS.

AREA IN SQ.FT.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT											TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
UNDER 500	2	8	(4)	(6)	28	27	23	39	13	1	151	40
500 - 999	(4)	(3)	1	2	(20)	(13)	(13)	(19)	(10)	(3)	88	23
1,000 - 2,999	2	5	0	1	23	16	16	22	8	5	98	26
3,000 - 4,999	0	2	0	1	4	3	1	4	2	0	17	4
5,000 - 9,999	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	3	0	11	2
10,000 - 19,999	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0	4	1
OVER 20,000	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3	0
0, UNKNOWN	14	10	0	3	12	4	4	4	9	3	63	0
TOTAL	22	28	5	13	92	65	60	91	47	12	435	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	8	18	5	10	80	61	56	87	38	9	-	-

SIZE OF SERVICES, PROF. BUSINESSES
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

NO. EMPLOYEES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT COL-PCNT	TOT. LIQ.	PCNT. LIP.	
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67				
ONE	0	0	0	(5)	26	(35)	24	37	15	4	146	43	32	27
2 TO 3	0	0	0	3	(33)	18	(18)	(15)	(16)	(3)	106	31	18	16
4 TO 5	0	0	0	0	10	4	3	10	3	2	32	9	5	15
6 TO 7	0	0	0	1	0	2	5	4	0	1	13	3	3	22
8 TO 19	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	8	5	1	21	6	1	4
20 TO 49	0	0	0	1	4	0	2	3	2	0	12	3	0	0
50+, CVER	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	5	1	0	0
0, UNKNOWN	22	28	5	3	12	5	6	14	4	1	100	0	21	27
TOTAL	22	28	5	13	92	65	60	91	47	12	435	100	80	18
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	0	0	10	80	60	54	77	43	11	335			

RENTS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY SERVICES, PROF. BUSINESS FIRMS

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT		
0.00 - 0.11	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	1	
0.12 - 0.24	4	6	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	14	3	
0.25 - 0.49	(5)	5	1	0	3	3	4	2	1	0	24	6	
0.50 - 0.74	2	(2)	0	2	9	7	5	3	2	0	32	8	
0.75 - 0.99	2	2	(2)	1	4	7	6	1	2	1	28	7	
1.00 - 1.49	0	2	1	1	18	(12)	5	2	3	0	44	11	
1.50 - 2.99	3	4	1	(5)	(22)	15	(11)	10	8	(4)	83	22	
3.00 - 9.99	0	2	0	2	27	12	24	(62)	(15)	2	146	38	
UNKNOWN	5	5	0	2	8	6	3	10	16	5	60	0	
TOTAL	22	28	5	13	92	65	60	91	47	12	435	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	17	23	5	11	84	59	57	81	31	7			

RENTALS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT, VERSUS SIZE OF FIRM
FOR SERVICES, PROF. BUSINESS FIRMS.

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							0, 50+ OVER OR X	TOT COL-PCNT	TOT-LIQ.	PCNT-LIQ
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49					
0.00 - 0.11	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	4	1	4
0.12 - 0.24	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	10	14	3	5
0.25 - 0.49	5	1	0	1	1	2	1	13	24	6	5
0.50 - 0.74	10	10	2	2	0	2	1	5	32	8	6
0.75 - 0.99	11	7	2	0	1	1	0	6	28	7	7
1.00 - 1.49	13	13	3	2	1	0	0	12	44	11	10
1.50 - 2.99	26	21	10	3	8	3	1	11	83	22	18
3.00 - 9.99	63	41	10	4	4	3	0	21	146	38	13
UNKN'WN	16	10	4	0	6	1	2	21	60	0	12
TOTAL	146	106	32	13	21	12	5	100	435	100	80

18

LIQUIDATIONS BY SERVICES, PROF.		FIRMS	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT	LESS (58-60) COL PCNT
REASON FOR LIQD.			58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67				
RETIREMENT			0	0	0	0	8	10	8	3	4	4	37	46	56	
LIQUOR LICENSE			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
OTHER LICENSE			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	
TO RE-ESTABLISH			0	0	0	0	2	3	3	2	1	0	11	13	17	
NOT DUE TO DISPL			0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	
CONSOLIDATION			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
DUE TO DISPL.			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SPACE UNAVAIL.			0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	0	8	10	12	
OTHER			5	6	3	0	2	2	2	2	0	0	22	27	12	
PRIOR MOVE-OUT			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
UNKNOWN			4	2	0	2	2	3	1	0	1	0	15	0	0	
TOTAL			9	8	3	2	21	20	14	8	6	4	95	100	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL..			5	6	3	-0	19	17	13	8	5	4				
(LESS UNKNOWNNS AND MOVE-OUTS)																
TOTAL LOAD			18	26	5	11	90	62	59	91	46	12				
(LESS UNKNOWNNS AND MOVE-OUTS)																
ADJ. TOT./LOAD			27	23	60	-0	21	27	22	8	10	33				

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY MANUFACTURING BUSINESS FIRMS.

AREA IN SQ. FT.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	
UNDER 500	0	0	0	0	5	2	0	0	2	0	9	4	
500 - 999	1	0	0	1	11	1	3	2	2	0	21	10	
1,000 - 2,999	(4)	1	0	0	27	(17)	(3)	5	3	1	61	30	
3,000 - 4,999	0	(3)	0	0	(22)	3	2	(2)	0	0	32	16	
5,000 - 9,999	2	0	0	(3)	20	2	2	5	(11)	1	46	23	
10,000 - 19,999	0	0	1	0	4	2	1	3	2	(1)	14	7	
OVER 20,000	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	1	3	2	14	7	
0, UNKNOWN	8	5	1	3	9	1	0	5	5	3	40	0	
TOTAL	15	9	2	7	102	31	12	23	28	8	237	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	7	4	1	4	93	30	12	18	23	5			

SIZE OF MANUFACTURING BUSINESSES
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

NO. EMPLOYEES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT COL-PCNT	TOT LIQ	PCNT LIQ
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
ONE	0	0	0	(2)	13	9	0	2	2	0	28	15	2
2 TO 3	0	0	0	0	22	4	(6)	5	4	1	42	22	5
4 TO 5	0	0	0	0	(14)	(3)	1	(2)	4	0	24	12	2
6 TO 7	0	0	0	0	10	3	2	1	(2)	0	18	9	1
8 TO 19	0	0	0	1	19	5	1	4	6	(4)	40	21	3
20 TO 49	0	0	0	1	10	4	0	3	7	1	26	13	0
50+, CVER	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	1	1	1	8	4	0
0, UNKNOWN	15	9	2	3	11	2	1	5	2	1	51	0	3
TOTAL	15	9	2	7	102	31	12	23	28	8	237	100	16
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	0	0	4	91	29	11	18	26	7			

RENTS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY MANUFACTURING BUSINESS FIRMS

DOLLARS/SQ. FT.	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	
0.00 - 0.11	0	0	(1)	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	
0.12 - 0.24	5	2	1	1	6	1	2	1	2	0	21	11	
0.25 - 0.49	(3)	(4)	0	0	22	9	(4)	2	1	1	46	24	
0.50 - 0.74	2	0	0	(2)	(28)	(6)	2	(1)	2	0	43	23	
0.75 - 0.99	3	2	0	0	16	2	2	4	(1)	(1)	31	16	
1.00 - 1.49	1	0	0	1	16	2	0	1	2	2	25	13	
1.50 - 2.99	0	0	0	0	5	4	0	0	3	0	12	6	
3.00 - 9.99	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	5	2	
UNKNOWN	0	1	0	3	7	6	1	13	16	4	51	0	
TOTAL	15	9	2	7	102	31	12	23	28	8	237	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	15	8	2	4	95	25	11	10	12	4			

RENTALS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT, VERSUS SIZE OF FIRM
FOR MANUFACTURING BUSINESS FIRMS.

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES										TOT COL-PCNT	TOT-LIQ.	PCNT-LIQ
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	OR X					
0.00 - 0.11	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0
0.12 - 0.24	0	4	1	1	3	2	0	10	21	11	3	14	14
0.25 - 0.49	3	9	10	2	6	5	3	8	46	24	3	6	6
0.50 - 0.74	9	7	4	7	8	4	0	4	43	23	4	9	9
0.75 - 0.99	0	9	3	0	4	4	2	9	31	16	3	9	9
1.00 - 1.49	7	4	1	4	4	2	1	2	25	13	1	4	4
1.50 - 2.99	4	2	0	0	3	0	1	2	12	6	0	0	0
3.00 - 9.99	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	5	2	0	0	0
UNKNOWN	4	7	3	2	12	8	1	14	51	0	2	3	3
TOTAL	28	42	24	18	40	26	8	51	237	100	16	6	6

LIQUIDATIONS BY MANUFACTURING	FIRMS	REASON FOR LIQD.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT											TOT COL-PCNT
			58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	
		RETIREMENT	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	0	5	31
		LIQUOR LICENSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		OTHER LICENSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		TO RE-ESTABLISH	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	3	18
		NOT DUE TO DISPL	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6
		CONSOLIDATION	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		DUE TO DISPL.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
		SPACE UNAVAIL.	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	18
		OTHER	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	25
		PRIOR MOVE-OUT	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	0
		UNKNOWN	4	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	6	0
		TOTAL	6	1	0	0	7	5	1	1	1	3	25	100
		ADJUSTED TOTAL..	1	1	-0	-0	7	3	1	1	1	1		
		(LESS UNKNOWNNS												
		AND MCVE-OUTS)												
		TOTAL LOAD	10	9	2	7	102	29	12	23	28	6		
		(LESS UNKNOWNNS												
		AND MCVE-OUTS)												
		ADJ. TOT./LOAD	10	11	-0	-0	6	10	8	4	3	16		

SIZE OF BUSINESS, BY SPACE OCCUPIED PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY OTHER, UNKNOWN BUSINESS FIRMS.

AREA IN SQ. FT.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT														TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	
UNDER 500	0	0	1	1	12	5	9	8	1	0	37	21			
500 - 999	0	2	0	0	2	2	(11)	(3)	2	0	22	13			
1,000 - 2,999	1	3	0	0	(10)	(20)	7	4	(7)	(2)	54	31			
3,000 - 4,999	0	(9)	1	2	3	4	4	3	0	0	26	15			
5,000 - 9,999	2	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	4	0	21	12			
10,000 - 19,999	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	4	2			
OVER 20,000	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	5	2			
0, UNKNOWN	11	11	9	6	12	13	12	8	10	4	96	0			
TOTAL	14	26	11	9	48	54	44	28	25	6	265	100			
ADJUSTED TOTAL	3	15	2	3	36	41	32	20	15	2					

SIZE OF OTHER, UNKNOWN BUSINESSES
AS MEASURED BY NO. OF EMPLOYEES
PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

NO. EMPLOYEES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT. COL-PCNT	TOT. EQ.	PCNT. LIR.
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
ONE	0	0	0	1	7	14	12	8	0	0	42	14	33
2 TO 3	0	0	0	(1)	6	(15)	(14)	(7)	2	1	46	5	10
4 TO 5	0	0	0	0	(7)	4	1	2	(4)	1	19	2	10
6 TO 7	0	0	0	0	5	1	0	0	3	0	9	1	11
8 TO 19	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	2	1	8	0	0
20 TO 49	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	1	2	0	7	1	14
50+, EVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0, UNKNOWN	14	26	11	6	20	18	17	7	12	3	134	39	29
TOTAL	14	26	11	9	48	54	44	28	25	6	265	62	23
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	0	0	3	28	36	27	21	13	131			

RENTS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT
BY OTHER, UNKNOWN BUSINESS FIRMS

DOLLARS/SQ. FT.	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
0.00 - 0.11	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	6	3	
0.12 - 0.24	(4)	(7)	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	15	9	
0.25 - 0.49	1	1	1	1	8	6	2	2	3	0	25	15	
0.50 - 0.74	0	4	2	(2)	2	(5)	4	1	1	0	21	12	
0.75 - 0.99	1	2	(1)	0	6	3	(3)	0	(1)	0	17	10	
1.00 - 1.49	0	0	1	0	(6)	2	2	0	1	1	13	7	
1.50 - 2.99	1	0	1	2	13	5	11	(6)	1	1	41	25	
3.00 - 9.99	1	0	2	1	6	2	2	8	3	1	26	15	
UNKNOWN	5	11	2	3	7	29	17	10	14	3	101	0	
TOTAL	14	26	11	9	48	54	44	28	25	6	265	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	9	15	9	6	41	25	27	18	11	-			

RENTALS, PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT, VERSUS SIZE OF FIRM
FOR OTHER, UNKNOWN BUSINESS FIRMS.

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							0, 50+ OVER OR X	TOT COL-PCNT	TOT-LIQ.	PCNT-LIQ	
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+					
0.00 - 0.11	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	3	2	33
0.12 - 0.24	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	14	15	9	7	46
0.25 - 0.49	1	8	2	2	0	2	0	10	25	15	8	32
0.50 - 0.74	2	5	2	1	0	0	0	11	21	12	8	38
0.75 - 0.99	2	1	1	1	0	1	0	11	17	10	6	35
1.00 - 1.49	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	7	13	7	1	7
1.50 - 2.99	12	15	3	2	3	0	0	6	41	25	2	4
3.00 - 9.99	4	4	4	2	2	2	0	8	26	15	4	15
UNKNCWN	17	10	4	1	3	2	0	64	101	0	24	23
TOTAL	42	46	19	9	8	7	0	134	265	100	62	23

LIQUIDATIONS BY OTHER, UNKNOWN FIRMS	REASCA FOR LIQD.	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT											LESS (58-60) COL PCNT	
		58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT COL-PCNT		
RETIREMENT		0	0	0	0	2	11	5	1	0	0	19	30	51
LIQUOR LICENSE		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
OTHER LICENSE		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TO RE-ESTABLISH		0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4	6	11
NOT DUE TO DISPL		0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	4	6	11
CONSOLIDATION		0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	5
DUE TO DISPL.		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SPACE UNAVAIL.		0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	6	11
OTHER		8	12	5	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	28	45	8
PRIOR MOVE-OUT		1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	5	0	-
UNKNOWN		2	6	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	13	0	4
TOTAL		11	18	5	2	10	18	9	2	4	1	80	100	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL..		8	12	5	-0	6	17	9	2	3	-0			
(LESS UNKNOWN AND MOVE-OUTS)														
TOTAL LOAD		11	20	11	7	44	53	44	28	24	5			
(LESS UNKNOWN AND MOVE-OUTS)														
ADJ. TOT./LOAD		72	60	45	-0	13	32	20	7	12	-0			

APPENDIX IV

SURVEY DATA: RELOCATION PROCESS

Subject	Page
A. Trading Areas	89 - 90
1. By Business Type	
2. By Size of Business	
B. Length of Time in Business	91
C. Location	92 - 99
1. Time Required to Find a New Location	
2. Means Used to Find a New Location	
3. Problems in Finding a New Location	
a. By Business Type	
b. By Size of Business	
c. Percentages of Total Possible Response	
d. Suitable Building Space	
e. Unreasonable or High Rents	
D. Difficulties Experienced Due to Relocation	100 - 102
1. By Business Type	
2. By Size of Business	
3. Percentages of Total Possible Response	
E. Layout of Working Space	103 - 104
1. Improved to Increase Efficiency	
2. Unimproved	
F. Changes in Product, Line or Type of Business	105
G. Percentage Change on Displacement of the Area Occupied	106
H. Percentage Change on Displacement of the Rent Paid	107
I. Changes in Employees	108 - 110
1. On Displacement by Size of Firms	
2. After Displacement by Size of Firm	
3. After Displacement - Over Time	

J. Percentage Change in Sales

111 - 116

1. By Size of Firm
2. By Type, for those Very Satisfied with their Location
3. By Type, for those Satisfied with their Location
4. By Type, for those Very Dissatisfied with their Location
5. Versus Changes in Employees on Displacement
6. Versus Changes in Employees after Displacement

K. Subjective Comparison of the New and Locations

117 - 123

1. All Firms
2. Retail Businesses
3. Retail Businesses
4. Storage and Distribution Firms
5. Service and Professional Firms
6. Manufacturing Firms
7. Other Firms

TRADING AREA

BUSINESS TYPE	LOCAL	BOSTON	METRO	N-ENG.	U.S.	I-NAT.
WHOLESALE	0	3	8	26	4	0
RETAIL	4	11	18	9	1	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	2	2	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	7	11	30	17	1	0
MANUFACTURING	0	6	15	17	4	2
OTHER, UNKNOWN	3	9	6	9	1	0
TOTAL	14	40	79	80	11	2

TRADING AREA

NO. OF EMPLOYEES	LOCAL	BOSTON	METRO	N-ENG.	U.S.	I-NAT.
ONE	2	10	11	1	0	0
2 TO 3	5	9	12	11	2	0
4 TO 5	1	6	13	16	0	0
6 TO 7	1	3	7	8	1	0
8 TO 19	1	4	15	22	3	2
20 TO 49	0	3	10	9	4	0
50+, CVER	0	0	3	3	1	0
0, UNKNOWN	4	5	8	10	0	0
TOTAL	14	40	79	80	11	2

LENGTH OF TIME IN BUSINESS PRIOR TO THE MOVE

BUSINESS TYPE	YEARS							PERCENTAGE OVER 8 OVER 20
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	
WHOLESALE	0	1	1	1	6	22	9	93 78
RETAIL	0	2	0	2	10	19	10	91 67
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	-- --
SERVICES, PROF.	0	1	5	1	32	23	4	89 42
MANUFACTURING	1	0	0	2	9	18	11	93 71
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	1	2	0	6	13	5	89 67
TOTAL	1	5	8	7	64	97	39	1
ROW PCNT	-	.02	.04	.03	.29	.44	.18	

TIME REQUIRED TO FIND A NEW LOCATION

BUSINESS TYPE	TIME IN MONTHS										UNDER 6 MO.	6 MO.& OVER
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6- 10	11- 25	26- OVER			
WHOLESALE	6	0	2	2	1	0	12	9	3	27	73	
RETAIL	11	2	2	5	1	0	9	10	5	47	53	
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	100	--	
SERVICES, PROF.	13	10	9	11	6	1	9	9	3	70	30	
MANUFACTURING	7	2	4	5	2	1	10	8	7	46	54	
OTHER, UNKNOWN	4	5	3	4	2	1	8	2	1	66	34	
TOTAL	42	19	21	29	12	4	48	38	25			
ROW PCNT	18	8	9	12	5	2	20	16	11	(100)		

THE MEANS USED TO FIND A NEW LOCATION.

BUSINESS TYPE	1	2	3	4	5	6	TOT
WHOLESALE	22	8	2	15	3	0	50
RETAIL	21	4	5	13	6	1	50
STORAGE, DISTRIB	2	1	2	0	0	0	5
SERVICES, PROF.	46	9	4	16	2	1	78
MANUFACTURING	21	10	9	22	2	0	64
OTHER, UNKNOWN	17	5	3	8	1	0	34
TOTAL	129	37	25	74	14	2	281
ROW PCNT	46	13	9	26	5	1	

1 - Located by self

2 - Through friends

3 - Other businessmen

4 - Real Estate agent

5 - Relocation agency

6 - Other

PROBLEMS IN FINDING A NEW LOCATION

BUSINESS TYPE	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
WHOLESALE	2	2	19	21	2	6	4	9	15	21	1
RETAIL	5	4	15	26	11	5	3	9	13	19	5
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
SERVICES, PROF.	1	0	17	33	8	14	5	8	13	17	2
MANUFACTURING	3	2	27	24	3	5	2	5	8	15	3
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	1	9	10	5	1	0	1	4	8	0
TOTAL	12	9	90	115	29	31	14	32	53	81	11

PROBLEMS IN FINDING A NEW LOCATION

NO. OF EMPLOYEES	PROBLEMS										
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
ONE	0	0	5	15	4	1	2	1	3	8	4
2 TO 3	2	3	12	19	5	5	4	9	13	13	3
4 TO 5	2	2	13	20	5	4	0	6	6	12	1
6 TO 7	0	0	7	8	0	1	2	0	2	6	0
8 TO 19	3	2	25	25	7	12	4	5	12	23	2
20 TO 49	2	0	14	8	3	4	0	2	6	12	0
50+, EVER	0	0	5	3	0	1	1	2	2	2	0
0, UNKNOWN	3	2	9	17	5	3	1	7	9	5	1
TOTAL	12	9	90	115	29	31	14	32	53	81	11

The problems were as follows:

- | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. Zoning restrictions. | 7. Leasing problems. |
| 2. Licensing problems. | 8. Financing problems. |
| 3. Unsuitable building space. | 9. Costs. |
| 4. Unreasonable rents. | 10. Unsuitable location. |
| 5. Hurried, not enough time. | 11. Liquidated after the move. |
| 6. Delays or the time consumed. | |

PROBLEMS IN FINDING A NEW LOCATION
 PERCENTAGES OF THE TOTAL POSSIBLE SURVEY
 RESPONSE BY BUSINESS TYPE AND SIZE
 INDICATING EACH PROBLEM

<u>Business Type</u>	<u>Problems</u> *										
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>11</u>
Wholesale	5	5	46	51	5	15	10	22	37	51	2
Retail	11	9	33	58	24	11	7	20	29	42	11
Services	1	-	24	46	11	20	7	11	18	24	3
Manufacturing	7	4	59	52	7	13	4	13	17	33	7
Other	-	3	30	33	17	3	-	3	13	27	-
All Types	5	4	38	48	12	13	6	13	22	34	5
 <u>No. Employees</u>											
One	-	-	17	52	14	3	7	3	10	28	14
2 to 3	5	7	29	45	12	12	10	21	31	31	7
4 to 5	5	5	35	54	14	11	-	16	16	32	3
6 to 7	-	-	35	40	-	5	10	-	10	30	-
8 to 19	6	4	51	51	14	24	8	10	24	47	4
20 to 49	8	-	54	31	12	33	-	8	67	46	-

*The problems were as follows:

- 1 Zoning restrictions.
- 2 Licensing problems.
- 3 Unsuitable building space.
- 4 Unreasonable rents.
- 5 Hurried, not enough time.
- 6 Delays or the time consumed.
- 7 Leasing problems.
- 8 Financing problems.
- 9 Costs.
- 10 Unsuitable location.
- 11 Liquidated after the move.

SURVEY FIRMS EXPRESSING DIFFICULTIES
IN FINDING SUITABLE BUILDING SPACE.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	1	5	2	1	4	6	0		19
RETAIL	0	1	0	0	6	3	1	2	2	0		15
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1		3
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	2	5	1		17
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	11	3	2	5	5	1		27
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	1	2	1		9
TOTAL	0	1	1	1	26	13	8	14	22	4		90

PERCENT OF TOTAL
YEARLY SURVEY
RESPONSE

-	-	-	-	-	25	59	54	36	35	43		50
---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	----	----	----	--	----

SURVEY FIRMS ENCOUNTERING UNREASONABLE OR HIGH RENTS.

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	2	3	2	3	5	4	2			21
RETAIL	0	1	0	0	11	5	2	3	4	0			26
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1			1
SERVICES, PROF.	1	0	0	1	6	4	4	9	7	1			33
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	11	4	1	2	6	0			24
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	1	0	3	1	2	0	2	1			10
TOTAL	1	1	1	3	34	16	12	19	23	5			115
PERCENT OF TOTAL YEARLY SURVEY RESPONSE	-	-	-	-	77	67	55	48	45	63			

DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED DUE TO RELOCATION

BUSINESS TYPE	1	2	3	4	5
WHOLESALE	22	11	8	13	13
RETAIL	22	23	25	33	25
STORAGE, DISTRIB	3	1	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	29	27	14	17	21
MANUFACTURING	20	13	8	11	7
OTHER, UNKNOWN	7	4	5	6	4
TOTAL	103	79	60	80	70

The difficulties are as follows:

1. Delays in receiving relocation payments.
2. Business interruption.
3. Loss of income prior to the property taking.
4. Loss of customers.
5. Unreasonable time lag between the project announcement and the property taking.

DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED DUE TO RELOCATION

NO. OF EMPLOYEES	1	2	3	4	5
ONE	12	12	6	9	7
2 TO 3	14	16	7	14	11
4 TO 5	17	9	11	13	10
6 TO 7	8	6	5	6	6
8 TO 19	26	17	12	13	18
20 TO 49	17	7	4	8	7
50+, OVER	1	1	1	2	1
0, UNKNOWN	8	11	14	15	10
TOTAL	103	79	60	80	70

DIFFICULTIES EXPERIENCED DUE TO RELOCATION
 PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL POSSIBLE SURVEY RE-
 SPONSE, BY BUSINESS TYPE AND SIZE
 INDICATING EACH DIFFICULTY

<u>Business Type</u>	<u>Difficulties</u> *				
	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Wholesale	54	27	20	32	32
Retail	49	51	56	51	56
Services	41	38	20	24	30
Manufacturing	43	28	17	24	15
Other	23	13	17	20	13
All Types	43	33	25	34	30

<u>No. Employees</u>					
One	41	41	21	31	24
2 to 3	33	38	17	33	26
4 to 5	46	24	30	35	27
6 to 7	40	30	25	30	30
8 to 19	53	35	24	27	37
20 to 49	65	27	15	31	27

*The difficulties are as follows:

- 1 Delays in receiving relocation payments.
- 2 Business interruption.
- 3 Loss on income prior to the property taking.
- 4 Loss of customers.
- 5 Unreasonable time lag between the project announcement and the property taking.

LAYOUT OF WORKING SPACE IMPROVED TO INCREASE EFFICIENCY.

THE ARRAY SHOWS THE NUMBER OF SURVEY FIRMS
THAT EXPERIENCED LABOR CHANGES ON DISPLACEMENT.

BUSINESS TYPE	LOSS										GAIN			SUMMARY LOSS	GAIN
	-11 OVER	-4- -10	-2- -3	-1- -1	0- 0	1- 1	2- 3	3- 10	4- OVER	5					
WHOLESALE	4	2	5	2	5	6	7	0	2				13	15	
RETAIL	0	2	1	4	8	1	3	3	0				7	7	
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0				2	1	
SERVICES, PROF.	1	1	2	5	7	7	7	6	0				9	20	
MANUFACTURING	3	3	1	2	9	3	3	6	3				9	15	
OTHER, UNKNOWN	2	2	1	2	5	2	0	0	0				7	2	
TOTAL	11	11	10	15	34	20	20	15	5				47	60	
PERCENT (100)	8	8	7	10	24	14	14	11	4					141	

LAYOUT OF WORKING SPACE UNIMPROVED.

THE ARRAY SHOWS THE NUMBER OF SURVEY FIRMS
THAT EXPERIENCED LABOR CHANGES ON DISPLACEMENT.

BUSINESS TYPE	LOSS					GAIN					SUMMARY	
	-11 OVER	-4- -10	-2- -3	-1- -1	0- 0	1- 1	2- 3	4- 10	11 OVER		LOSS	GAIN
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0		1	1
RETAIL	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	0		1	1
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		-	-
SERVICES, PROF.	0	1	0	0	3	2	0	0	1		1	3
MANUFACTURING	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1		2	1
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0		-	2
TOTAL	0	3	0	2	7	5	1	0	2		5	8

SURVEY RESPONSE...

CHANGES IN PRODUCT, LINE, OR TYPE OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS TYPE	METHOD OF OPERATION	TYPE OF BUSINESS	DROP OR ADD ANY LINE, SERV., PRD.	% MAX. OF TOTAL	SURVEY TOTAL
WHOLESALE	17	3	12	41	41
RETAIL	13	8	17	38	45
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	0	0	-	5
SERVICES, PROF.	8	3	7	11	71
MANUFACTURING	8	0	7	17	46
OTHER, UNKNOWN	1	0	5	17	30
TOTAL	48	14	48		

PERCENTAGE CHANGE ON DISPLACEMENT
OF THE AREA OCCUPIED BY ALL BUSINESS FIRMS

PERCENTAGE CHANGE	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT	COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
NEG.-CVER 51	0	0	0	0	7	4	2	4	7	0	24	16	
26 TO 50	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	5	3	0	18	12	
11 TO 25	0	1	0	0	6	2	1	1	3	0	14	9	
5 TO 10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	5	3	
1 TO 5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	
4 TO 0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	4	5	0	14	9	
9 TO 5	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	3	
24 TO 10	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	5	0	13	8	
49 TO 25	0	0	0	0	3	1	1	2	3	0	10	7	
POS.-CVER 50	0	0	0	0	11	5	4	8	17	3	48	32	
TOTAL	0	1	0	1	37	17	17	30	46	3	152	<u>100</u>	

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN DISPLACEMENT
OF THE RENT PAID BY ALL BUSINESS FIRMS

PERCENTAGE CHANGE	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
NEG.-COVER 51	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	0		5	5
26 TO 50	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0		3	3
11 TO 25	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	2	0		9	8
5 TO 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0	0
1 TO 5	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0		1	1
4 TO 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0		3	3
9 TO 5	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0		3	3
24 TO 10	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	2	2	1		14	13
49 TO 25	0	0	0	0	7	3	4	3	2	1		20	19
POS.-COVER 50	0	1	0	0	12	9	4	11	10	1		48	45
TOTAL	0	1	0	1	32	16	14	19	20	3		106	100

CHANGES IN EMPLOYEES ON DISPLACEMENT
BY SIZE OF BUSINESS FIRM.

NO. OF EMPLOYEES	LOSS					GAIN					SUMMARY	
	-11 OVER	-4- -10	-2- -3	-1- -1	0- 0	1- 1	2- 3	4- 10	11 OVER	LOSS	GAIN	
ONE	0	0	0	1	22	1	0	0	1	2	0	
2 TO 3	0	0	1	5	23	2	3	0	0	13	9	
4 TO 5	0	0	2	1	19	8	3	1	0	6	19	
6 TO 7	0	1	1	1	12	2	3	0	0	7	10	
8 TO 19	0	3	6	2	24	2	2	3	0	18	14	
20 TO 49	1	2	3	1	10	0	0	6	2	4	12	
50+, OVER	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	4	
0, UNKNOWN	0	1	2	2	9	5	1	0	2	-	-	
TOTAL	1	7	15	14	120	20	12	12	7	52	68	
ROW PCNT	7	9	6	11	25	16	13	9	4	161		

CHANGES IN EMPLOYEES AFTER DISPLACEMENT
BY SIZE OF BUSINESS FIRM.

NO. OF EMPLOYEES	LOSS					GAIN			SUMMARY	
	-11 OVER	-4- -10	-2- -3	-1- -1	0- 0	1- 1	2- 3	4- 10	LOSS	GAIN
ONE	0	0	0	1	22	1	0	0	1	2
2 TO 3	0	0	1	5	23	2	3	0	6	5
4 TO 5	0	0	2	1	19	8	3	1	3	12
6 TO 7	0	1	1	1	12	2	3	0	3	5
8 TO 19	0	3	6	2	24	2	2	3	11	7
20 TO 49	1	2	3	1	10	0	0	6	7	8
50+, CVER	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	5
0, UNKNOWN	0	1	2	2	9	5	1	0	5	8
TOTAL	1	7	15	14	120	20	12	12	38	52
ROW PCNT (100)	--	3	7	7	58	10	6	6		208

SURVEY RESPONSE...

CHANGES IN EMPLOYEES AFTER DISPLACEMENT.
FOR ALL SURVEY BUSINESS FIRMS.

EMPLOYEES	YEAR OF DISPLACEMENT											GROUP TOTAL	PERCENT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT		
OVER 11	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1		
4 - 10	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	7		
LOSS 2 - 3	0	1	0	0	7	0	1	0	6	0	15	37	17
1 - 1	0	0	0	1	3	4	5	0	1	0	14	-	
-0- 0-0	0	0	1	0	18	21	15	26	36	3	120	120	58
1 - 1	0	0	0	0	5	3	2	5	4	1	20	-	
GAIN 2 - 3	1	0	0	0	4	2	0	2	3	0	12	51	25
4 - 10	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	3	0	2	12		
OVER 11	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	7		
TOTAL	1	3	1	3	46	32	25	38	52	7	208	208	
TOTAL CHANGE	1	3	0	3	28	11	10	12	16	4			
(%) RATIO: GAIN TO LOSS													
	-	-	-	-	53	64	40	92	50	75			

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN SALES (PER YEAR SINCE DISPLACEMENT)

BY SIZE OF BUSINESS FIRM.

NO. OF EMPLOYEES	LOSS			GAIN							SUMMARY		
	51, OVER	26- 50	11- 25	6- 10	1- 5	0- 4	5- 9	10- 24	25- 49	50+ OVER	TOT	LOSS	GAIN
ONE	0	0	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	8	3	1
2 TO 3	0	0	0	0	4	6	0	1	1	1	13	4	3
4 TO 5	0	0	0	0	3	6	2	0	0	0	11	3	2
6 TO 7	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	7	2	3
8 TO 19	0	0	0	0	2	15	0	0	0	0	17	2	-
20 TO 49	0	0	0	0	0	10	1	1	0	0	12	-	2
50+, CVER	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	1	0	5	-	2
0, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	2	0	6	0	0	0	2	10	2	2
TOTAL	0	0	0	3	13	52	6	4	2	3	83	20	18
PERCENT	-	-	-	4	16	63	7	5	2	4	101		101

SALES BY TYPE OF BUSINESS FOR THOSE VERY SATISFIED
WITH THEIR PRESENT LOCATION

BUSINESS TYPE	PERCENTAGE CHANGE/YEAR									
	LOSS					GAIN				
	51, OVER	26- 50	11- 25	6- 10	1- 5	0- 4	5- 9	10- 24	25- 49	50, OVER
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	1
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	1	8	1	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	2	1	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	1	22	4	4	2	1

SALES BY TYPE OF BUSINESS FOR THOSE SATISFIED
WITH THEIR PRESENT LOCATION

BUSINESS TYPE	PERCENTAGE CHANGE/YEAR									
	LOSS					GAIN				
	51, OVER	26- 50	11- 25	6- 10	1- 5	0- 4	5- 9	10- 24	25- 49	50, OVER
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	1	1	9	0	0	0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	1	1	6	0	0	0	0
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	2	3	29	0	0	0	0

SALES BY TYPE OF BUSINESS FOR THOSE VERY DISSATISFIED
WITH THEIR PRESENT LOCATION

BUSINESS TYPE	PERCENTAGE CHANGE/YEAR									
	LOSS					GAIN				
	51, OVER	26- 50	11- 25	6- 10	1- 5	0- 4	5- 9	10- 24	25- 49	50, OVER
WHOLESALE	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
RETAIL	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	1
MANUFACTURING	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	0	0	0	1	9	1	2	0	0	2

PERCENTAGE CHANGE IN SALES VERSUS
CHANGES IN EMPLOYEES ON DISPLACEMENT.

EMPLOYEE CPG.	LOSS				(SALES)				GAIN				TOT	%	SUMMARY	
	51, OVER	26- 50	11- 25	6- 10	1- 5	0- 4	5- 9	10- 24	25- 49	50, OVER	LOSS	GAIN				
OVER 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-	-	-	-	-
4 - 10	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
LOSS 2 - 3	0	0	0	0	2	6	2	0	0	1	11	18	23	2	3	3
1 - 1	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	1	6	3	1	3	1	1
-0- 0-0	0	0	0	0	7	24	0	1	1	0	33	33	42	7	2	2
1 - 1	0	0	0	1	0	7	0	0	0	0	8	1	-	1	-	-
GAIN 2 - 3	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	5	27	35	-	3	3
4 - 10	0	0	0	0	0	7	1	0	0	0	8	-	-	-	1	1
OVER 11	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	6	-	-	-	4	4
TOTAL	0	0	0	2	12	50	5	4	2	3	78	14	14	14	14	14
PERCENT	-	-	-	3	15	64	6	5	3	4						

SURVEY RESPONSE TO A REQUEST TO ALL BUSINESS FIRMS
TO COMPARE THEIR NEW AND OLD LOCATIONS.

CONDITIONS	NEW BETTER	SAME	OLD BETTER	RATIO: NEW vs OLD
GENERAL BUSINESS	94	91	53	1.7 : 1
COSTS	41	49	133	1 : 3.2
PARKING	104	71	57	1.8 : 1
ACCESS	108	69	50	2.2 : 1
MERCHANDISE HANDLING	106	50	30	3.5 : 1
WORKING SPACE AND LAYOUT	164	28	38	4.3 : 1
OTHER	4	0	2	-
TOTAL	621	358	363	1.7 : 1
PER CENT	46	27	27	

SURVEY RESPONSE TO A REQUEST TO WHOLESALE
TO COMPARE THEIR NEW AND OLD LOCATIONS.

CONDITIONS	FIRMS			RATIO: NEW vs. OLD	
	NEW BETTER	SAME	OLD BETTER	NEW	OLD
GENERAL BUSINESS	18	13	6	3	1
COSTS	11	4	20	1	2
PARKING	28	6	4	7	1
ACCESS	24	8	3	8	1
MERCHANDISE HANDLING	29	3	4	7	1
WORKING SPACE AND LAYOUT	35	2	1	35	1
OTHER	1	0	1	-	-
TOTAL	146	36	39	3.4	1
PER CENT	66	16	18		

SURVEY RESPONSE TO A REQUEST TO RETAIL
TO COMPARE THEIR NEW AND OLD LOCATIONS.

FIRMS

CONDITIONS	NEW BETTER	SAME	OLD BETTER	RATIO:	
				NEW	OLD
GENERAL BUSINESS	13	7	17	1	1.3
COSTS	2	2	28	1	14
PARKING	11	13	11	1	1
ACCESS	13	8	12	1.1	1
MERCHANDISE HANDLING	17	10	9	1.8	1
WORKING SPACE AND LAYOUT	16	6	12	1.3	1
OTHER	2	0	0	0	-
TOTAL	74	46	89	1	1.2
PER CENT	35	22	43		

SURVEY RESPONSE TO A REQUEST TO STORAGE, DISTRIB FIRMS
TO COMPARE THEIR NEW AND OLD LOCATIONS.

CONDITIONS.	NEW BETTER	SAME	OLD BETTER
GENERAL BUSINESS	2	2	0
COSTS	1	0	3
PARKING	3	0	1
ACCESS	2	0	1
MERCHANDISE HANDLING	2	0	0
WORKING SPACE AND LAYOUT	3	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0
TOTAL	13	2	5

SURVEY RESPONSE TO A REQUEST TO SERVICES, PROF. FIRMS
TO COMPARE THEIR NEW AND OLD LOCATIONS.

CONDITIONS	NEW BETTER		SAME		OLD BETTER		RATIO: NEW vs. OLD	
GENERAL BUSINESS	22	28	11	2	1	:		
COSTS	4	21	28	1	7	:		
PARKING	11	23	21	1	1.9	:		
ACCESS	15	23	18	1	1.2	:		
MERCHANDISE HANDLING	5	16	5	1	1	:		
WORKING SPACE AND LAYOUT	35	10	10	3.5	1	:		
OTHER	0	0	0	-	-	:		
TOTAL	92	121	93	1	1	:		
PERCENT	30	40	30					

SURVEY RESPONSE TO A REQUEST TO MANUFACTURING FIRMS
TO COMPARE THEIR NEW AND OLD LOCATIONS.

CONDITIONS	NEW BETTER	SAME	OLD BETTER	RATIO: NEW vs. OLD
GENERAL BUSINESS	14	19	5	2.8 : 1
COSTS	7	12	20	1 : 2.8
PARKING	18	12	11	1.6 : 1
ACCESS	23	13	5	4.6 : 1
MERCHANDISE HANDLING	23	10	5	4.6 : 1
WORKING SPACE AND LAYOUT	30	4	8	3.8 : 1
OTHER	0	9	0	- : -
TOTAL	115	70	54	2.1 : 1
PERCENT	48	29	23	

SURVEY RESPONSE TO A REQUEST TO OTHER, UNKNOWN FIRMS
TO COMPARE THEIR NEW AND OLD LOCATIONS.

CONDITIONS	NEW BETTER	SAME	OLD BETTER	RATIO: NEW vs. OLD
GENERAL BUSINESS	7	9	8	1 : 1.1
COSTS	5	6	14	1 : 2.8
PARKING	5	11	5	1 : 1
ACCESS	7	9	8	1 : 1.1
MERCHANDISE HANDLING	1	8	3	1 : 3
WORKING SPACE AND LAYOUT	10	4	6	1.7 : 1
OTHER	0	0	0	--
TOTAL	35	47	44	1 : 1.2
PERCENT	28	37	35	

APPENDIX V

RELOCATION PROGRAM

A. Reimbursements

124 - 148

1. All Firms

- a. Total Amount Paid to Dislocated Firms
- b. Time Required to Process Claims
- c. Size of Reimbursement Received - Over Time
- d. Size of Reimbursement Versus Size of Business
- e. Difference Between Amount Requested and Received

2. Unremunerated Firms

- a. Characteristics: Rentals Versus Size
- b. Liquidations

3. Wholesale Firms

- a. Size of Reimbursement Received Over Time
- b. Size of Reimbursement Versus Size of Business
- c. Difference Between Amount Requested and Received

4. Retail Firms

5. Storage and Distribution Firms

6. Service and Professional Firms

7. Manufacturing Firms

8. Other Firms

B. Small Business Displacement Payments

149 - 153

- 1. Coverage: Number of Recipients and Magnitude of Payment
- 2. Time Required to Process SBDP
- 3. Time Required to Receive SBDP
- 4. Size and Type of Firm Receiving Payments
- 5. Size and Type of Firm not Receiving Payments

C. Small Business Administration Disaster Loan Program

154 - 156

1. Magnitude by Type of Business
2. Type Versus Size of Business by Space Occupied
3. Type Versus Size of Business by Employees

D. Subjective Responses: Survey Data

157 - 170

1. Reimbursements
 - a. Critical to Relocation by Type of Business
 - b. Critical to Relocation by Size of Business
2. Adequacy of the Compensation
 - a. Responses Over Time
 - b. Responses by Type of Business
 - c. Responses by Size of Business
3. Relocation Help Provided by the LPA
4. Suggestions for Improvements in Relocation Procedures
5. Attitudes to the Way in Which Relocation was Handled
 - a. All Firms
 - b. Wholesale Firms
 - c. Retail Firms
 - d. Storage and Distribution Firms
 - e. Service and Professional Firms
 - f. Manufacturing Firms
 - g. Other Firms

AMOUNT PAID TO ALL DISLOCATED FIRMS (MOVING AND SBDP),
BY TYPE OF BUSINESS, OVER TIME (1000'S OF DOLLARS).

BUSINESS TYPE	YEAR OF BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT											TOT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
WHOLESALE	0	12	0	48	396	259	38	196	135	10	1094	
RETAIL	45	46	19	21	472	389	161	163	164	25	1505	
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0	-0	17	13	29	7	42	2	110	
SERVICES, PROF.	6	15	1	5	115	69	139	140	128	12	630	
MANUFACTURING	12	12	3	29	647	124	69	153	142	7	1198	
OTHER, UNKNOWN	1	4	1	5	46	45	28	68	14	2	214	
TOTAL	64	89	24	108	1693	899	464	727	625	58	4751	

TIME REQUIRED TO PROCESS CLAIMS, BY TYPE OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS TYPE	TIME IN MONTHS								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6- 10	11- 25	26- OVER
WHOLESALE									
FOCC	0	4	7	2	4	5	4	1	1
OTHER	3	11	21	14	10	7	2	8	3
RETAIL									
HARDWARE, ETC.	0	13	9	8	3	1	1	2	1
DRYGOODS	5	11	9	9	2	1	1	6	0
FOCC	9	17	18	13	7	4	3	6	3
CLOTHING	3	8	16	10	4	1	0	7	1
APPLN., FURN.	3	5	10	7	0	2	1	3	0
EATING	4	8	16	5	4	1	2	3	0
DRINK, LIQUOR	6	13	11	8	9	5	1	1	2
OTHER	7	20	28	13	8	4	3	1	2
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	9	11	2	6	1	0	2	2
FINANCE, R.E.	5	8	7	4	1	1	0	6	2
PERSONAL SERVICE									
OTHER	10	22	24	18	4	5	2	6	2
BARBER, BEAUTY	3	12	10	12	3	1	0	0	1
BUS. SERV, PROF.	9	32	35	33	13	13	4	3	0
NONPROFIT	2	14	7	10	6	1	1	2	1
ROOMING HOUSES	8	20	15	2	0	3	0	0	1
MANUFACTURING									
PRINTING	0	5	3	9	8	3	0	2	1
FOCC	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
FABRC, APPAREL	1	1	6	8	1	2	1	1	0
OTHER	2	16	12	19	13	6	5	5	2
UNKNOWN, OTHER	0	4	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	82	253	278	208	107	68	32	65	25
ROW PCNT (100)	7.3	22.6	24.9	18.6	9.6	6.1	2.9	5.8	2.2

REIMBURSEMENTS RECEIVED BY ALL BUSINESS FIRMS.

DOLLARS	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	
-500	(37)	49	(17)	11	85	90	51	69	29	3	441
501-1000	11	(23)	7	(4)	47	50	21	19	12	2	196
1001-1500	8	13	0	4	24	(29)	(13)	(9)	5	0	105
1501-2000	5	7	1	3	(30)	18	15	9	(7)	0	95
2001-2500	14	13	0	3	23	17	5	7	10	1	93
2501-3000	0	1	5	2	53	48	19	15	15	0	158
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	40	18	10	15	6	1	90
5001-10000	0	0	0	3	37	27	12	26	13	0	118
10001-25000	0	0	0	3	24	14	5	9	13	0	68
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	0	0	14
NONE REC'D	62	33	6	33	90	54	53	46	93	52	522
TOTAL	137	139	36	66	465	367	204	224	203	59	1900
ADJUSTED TOTAL	75	106	30	33	375	313	151	178	110	-	
PERCENT											
NONE REC'D	45.3	23.7	16.7	50.0	19.4	14.7	26.0	20.5	45.8*	x	

*PAYMENTS IN THE LAST QUARTER OF 1966 MAY HAVE BEEN
IN PROCESSING AT THE TIME THE STUDY WAS MADE.

REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED BY ALL
FIRMS FOR MOVING COSTS

DOLLARS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							0+	TOT COL-PONT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER		
-500	(139)	83	15	3	12	3	0	186	441
501-1000	51	48	13	5	7	0	1	71	196
1001-1500	18	(23)	11	4	4	1	0	44	195
1501-2000	17	28	12	7	8	3	0	20	95
2001-2500	10	21	13	2	6	5	0	36	93
2501-3000	19	50	(33)	(19)	17	3	0	17	158
3001-5000	10	26	22	13	10	0	1	8	90
5001-10000	2	20	23	14	(30)	(15)	1	13	118
10001-25000	2	3	0	5	23	22	(10)	3	68
25000+, OVER	1	0	0	1	2	6	3	1	14
NONE REC'D	100	87	33	14	29	16	8	235	522
TOTAL	369	389	175	87	148	74	24	634	1900
ADJUSTED TOTAL	269	307	142	73	119	58	16	-	
PERCENT									
NONE REC'D	27.1	22.4	18.9	16.1	19.6	9.2	33.3	37.1	

REIMBURSEMENTS, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AMOUNT REQUESTED
AND AMOUNT RECEIVED BY ALL FIRMS

DIFFERENCE(\$)	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	CON-PCNT
NONE	96	79	14	25	195	191	123	153	126	38	1040	54
-500	24	27	13	23	147	118	58	49	50	15	524	27
501-1000	6	12	4	3	37	16	13	4	8	1	104	5
1001-1500	3	12	3	2	8	9	1	3	5	0	46	2
1501-2000	4	5	1	1	13	6	1	4	5	0	40	2
2001-2500	0	1	0	3	8	3	2	1	1	1	20	1
2501-3000	1	1	0	1	6	5	0	1	1	1	17	0
3001-5000	3	2	0	4	29	6	2	3	1	2	52	2
5001-10000	0	0	0	1	10	12	3	3	2	0	31	1
10001-25000	0	0	0	1	7	1	1	2	0	1	13	0
25000+, OVER	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	1	4	0	13	0
TOTAL	137	139	36	66	465	367	204	224	203	59	1900	100

CHARACTERISTICS OF BUSINESS FIRMS
NOT BEING REIMBURSED FOR MOVING EXPENSES.

DOLLARS/SQ.FT.	NO. OF EMPLOYEES								TOT COL-PCNT	TOT-LIQ.	PCNT-LIQ.	
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	0, OR X				
0.00 - 0.11	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4	1	2	50
0.12 - 0.24	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	18	26	10	7	26
0.25 - 0.49	5	4	2	0	1	(2)	0	20	34	14	12	35
0.50 - 0.74	11	7	3	(1)	(1)	1	0	20	44	18	16	36
0.75 - 0.99	4	3	0	1	1	0	1	10	20	8	2	10
1.00 - 1.49	(7)	(3)	(3)	0	0	0	0	13	26	10	4	15
1.50 - 2.99	9	7	3	1	2	0	1	12	35	14	8	22
3.00 - 9.99	20	14	5	0	0	2	0	10	51	21	10	19
UNKNKN	20	15	3	2	8	1	2	56	107	0	34	31
TOTAL	78	55	20	7	14	7	4	162	347	100	95	27
RCW PERCENT	42	30	11	4	8	8	42	-	100			
TOTAL LIQD.	19	14	3	2	5	2	0	50	95			
PCNT LIQD.	24	25	15	28	35	28	0	30	27			

LIQUIDATIONS BY TYPE OF BUSINESS
FOR THOSE FIRMS NOT BEING REIMBURSED FOR MOVING EXPENSES.

BUSINESS TYPE	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							50+ OVER OR X	TOT	TOT-LOAD	PCNT-LIQ
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+				
WHOLESALE	4	6	1	2	3	0	0	5	21	45	47
RETAIL	1	4	2	0	0	1	0	13	21	71	30
STORAGE, DISTRIB.	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	11	13	66	20
SERVICES, PRCF.	7	4	0	0	1	0	0	8	20	72	28
MANUFACTURING	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	3	27	11
OTHER, UNKNOWN	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	17	66	26
TOTAL	19	14	3	2	5	2	0	50	95	347	27

REIMBURSEMENTS RECEIVED BY
WHOLESALE FIRMS

DOLLARS	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
-500	0	1	0	0	3	5	4	3	2	0	18	13	
501-1000	0	0	0	0	5	2	2	2	3	0	14	10	
1001-1500	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	2	
1501-2000	0	(1)	0	1	2	0	(1)	1	0	0	6	4	
2001-2500	0	3	0	(1)	4	1	0	1	1	0	11	8	
2501-3000	0	1	0	0	4	1	2	1	(2)	0	11	8	
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	(3)	(4)	1	(4)	1	0	13	9	
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	10	9	3	8	5	0	35	25	
10001-25000	0	0	0	2	6	4	0	4	2	0	18	13	
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	6	4	
NONE REC'D	0	1	0	4	10	4	9	8	21	10	67	0	
TOTAL	0	8	0	9	51	34	22	32	37	10	203	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	0	7	0	5	41	30	13	24	16	0			
PERCENT													
NONE REC'D	-	13	-	44	20	12	41	25	57	x			

REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED BY
WHOLESALE FIRMS FOR MOVING COSTS

DOLLARS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							50+ 20- 49 OVER OR X	TOT COL-PCNT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19				
-500	6	2	1	0	1	0	0	8	13
501-1000	(4)	4	2	1	2	0	0	1	10
1001-1500	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2
1501-2000	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	4
2001-2500	2	1	3	1	1	0	0	3	8
2501-3000	2	(2)	(4)	1	1	0	0	1	8
3001-5000	0	4	3	(3)	3	0	0	0	9
5001-10000	0	4	7	7	(12)	2	0	3	25
10001-25000	0	1	0	1	6	(8)	(1)	1	13
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	4
NONE REC'D	11	16	6	6	11	2	2	13	0
TOTAL	26	34	27	22	38	15	5	36	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	15	18	21	16	27	13	3	23	
PERCENT									
NONE REC'D	42	47	22	27	29	13	40	x	

REIMBURSEMENTS, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AMOUNT REQUESTED
AND AMOUNT RECEIVED BY WHOLESALE FIRMS

DIFFERENCE(\$)	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT COL-PCNT
NONE	0	2	0	1	14	13	14	17	25	6	92 45
-500	0	1	0	4	23	12	7	9	4	1	61 30
501-1000	0	2	0	0	3	1	1	1	2	0	10 4
1001-1500	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	5 2
1501-2000	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	2	2	0	7 3
2001-2500	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	1	6 2
2501-3000	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	1	5 2
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5 2
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4 1
10001-25000	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4 1
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	4 1
TOTAL	0	8	0	9	51	34	22	32	37	10	203 100

REIMBURSEMENTS RECEIVED BY
RETAIL FIRMS

DOLLARS	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT																TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67							
-500	19	19	5	3	18	29	10	3	4	2	112						22
501-1000	(7)	(10)	(5)	2	15	18	5	5	5	2	74						14
1001-1500	6	11	0	(2)	8	15	3	4	0	0	49						9
1501-2000	5	3	1	0	7	(11)	5	1	1	0	34						6
2001-2500	9	6	0	2	(8)	8	(1)	(2)	(3)	0	39						7
2501-3000	0	0	4	2	29	33	14	11	12	0	105						20
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	13	8	3	4	1	1	30						5
5001-10000	0	0	0	1	9	14	5	6	4	0	39						7
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	7	6	1	0	2	0	16						3
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3						0
NONE REC'D	27	10	0	8	21	14	9	5	20	15	129						0
TOTAL	73	59	15	20	138	156	56	41	52	20	630						100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	46	49	15	12	117	142	47	36	32	-							
PERCENT																	
NONE REC'D	37	17	-	40	15	4	16	12	38	x							

REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED BY
RETAIL FIRMS FOR MOVING COSTS

DOLLARS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							0, 50+ OVER OR X	TOT COL-PCT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49			
-500	34	14	2	0	2	2	0	58	22
501-1000	(18)	14	8	0	2	0	0	32	14
1001-1500	8	13	1	2	1	0	0	24	9
1501-2000	5	13	5	1	0	0	0	10	6
2001-2500	4	(10)	2	0	2	(3)	0	18	7
2501-3000	12	40	(24)	(11)	8	0	0	10	20
3001-5000	7	9	9	2	(1)	0	1	1	5
5001-10000	0	11	11	2	8	2	(1)	4	7
10001-25000	0	1	0	0	9	2	3	1	3
25000+, OVER	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
NONE REC'D	21	25	10	4	5	2	1	61	0
TOTAL	110	150	72	23	38	12	6	219	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	89	125	62	19	33	10	5	-	
PERCENT NONE REC'D	19	17	14	17	13	17	17	x	

REIMBURSEMENTS, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AMOUNT REQUESTED
AND AMOUNT RECEIVED BY RETAIL FIRMS

DIFFERENCE(\$)	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	COL-PCNT
NONE	57	34	4	9	63	74	30	24	23	13	341	54
-500	9	12	6	7	40	52	19	12	18	5	180	28
501-1000	2	3	2	1	11	9	4	0	1	1	34	5
1001-1500	1	7	2	1	6	5	1	2	0	0	25	3
1501-2000	2	1	1	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	8	1
2001-2500	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	0
2501-3000	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	4	0
3001-5000	2	1	0	2	7	3	1	1	0	1	18	2
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	6	7	0	0	0	0	13	2
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	4	0
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	73	59	15	20	138	156	56	41	52	20	630	100

REIMBURSEMENTS RECEIVED BY
STORAGE, DISTRIB FIRMS

DOLLARS	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
-500	3	1	0	0	4	8	2	2	4	0	24	53	
501-1000	0	0	1	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	9	20	
1001-1500	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	
1501-2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
2001-2500	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	
2501-3000	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3	6	
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	4	
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	3	6	
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NONE REC'D	10	8	2	8	25	11	5	5	8	3	85	0	
TOTAL	13	9	3	8	34	27	10	9	14	3	130	100	

REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED BY
STORAGE, DISTRIB FIRMS FOR MOVING COSTS

DOLLARS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES										TOT COL-PCNT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	OR	X		
-500	2	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	17	24	53
501-1000	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	9	20
1001-1500	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4
1501-2000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2001-2500	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
2501-3000	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	6
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
10001-25000	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	3	6
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NONE REC'D	12	4	1	0	2	2	0	0	64	85	0
TOTAL	17	11	1	2	3	2	0	0	94	130	100
PERCENT											
NONE REC'D	77	89	67	100	74	41	50	56	x		

REIMBURSEMENTS RECEIVED BY
SERVICES, PROF. FIRMS

DOLLARS	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
-500	(8)	9	(3)	(4)	36	16	19	(48)	15	1	159	47	
501-1000	3	(7)	1	2	(19)	(15)	(7)	10	(3)	0	67	19	
1001-1500	0	1	0	0	5	7	5	3	2	0	23	6	
1501-2000	0	3	0	2	7	3	5	7	4	0	31	9	
2001-2500	1	1	0	0	3	3	3	2	4	0	17	5	
2501-3000	0	0	0	0	3	7	1	2	0	0	13	3	
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	5	2	3	1	2	0	13	3	
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	1	1	4	3	0	0	9	2	
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2	0	5	1	
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NONE REC'D	10	7	1	5	11	11	12	15	15	11	98	0	
TOTAL	22	28	5	13	92	65	60	91	47	12	435	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	12	21	4	8	81	54	48	76	32				
PERCENT													
NONE REC'D	45	25	20	38	12	17	20	16	32	x			

REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED BY
SERVICES, PROF. FIRMS FOR MOVING COSTS

DOLLARS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES										TOT COL-PCNT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	0, OR X			
-500	(70)	35	7	2	5	1	0	39	159	47	
501-1000	23	(19)	1	2	2	0	1	19	67	19	
1001-1500	8	3	5	1	(1)	1	0	4	23	6	
1501-2000	5	12	(3)	0	4	2	0	5	31	9	
2001-2500	1	5	6	(1)	0	(2)	0	2	17	5	
2501-3000	2	3	1	3	3	0	0	1	13	3	
3001-5000	0	4	4	2	0	0	0	3	13	3	
5001-10000	2	3	0	1	0	2	0	1	9	2	
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	5	1	
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NONE REC'D	35	22	5	1	5	2	2	26	98	0	
TOTAL	146	106	32	13	21	12	5	100	435	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	111	84	27	12	16	10	3				
PERCENT											
NONE REC'D	24	21	16	8	24	17	40	-			

REIMBURSEMENTS RECEIVED BY
MANUFACTURING FIRMS

DOLLARS	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT											TOT COL-PONT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
-500	3	1	0	1	8	3	0	3	2	0	21	11
501-1000	0	(5)	0	0	6	3	2	1	1	0	18	9
1001-1500	(2)	0	0	(1)	6	1	2	0	0	0	12	6
1501-2000	0	0	0	0	11	3	(2)	0	1	0	17	8
2001-2500	4	3	0	0	7	(3)	0	1	1	1	20	10
2501-3000	0	0	1	0	(9)	5	1	1	1	0	18	9
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	19	2	3	(1)	(1)	0	26	13
5001-10000	0	0	0	1	14	3	0	7	4	0	29	15
10001-25000	0	0	0	1	9	3	2	4	5	0	24	12
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	2
NONE REC'D	6	0	1	3	8	5	0	5	12	7	47	0
TOTAL	15	9	2	7	102	31	12	23	28	8	237	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	9	9	1	4	94	26	12	18	16	x		
PERCENT												
NONE REC'D	40	-	50	43	8	16	-	22	43	x		

REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED BY
MANUFACTURING FIRMS FOR MOVING COSTS

DOLLARS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							50+ OVER OR X	TOT COL-PCNT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+		
-500	8	5	0	0	2	0	0	6	21
501-1000	2	8	1	1	1	0	0	5	18
1001-1500	0	(4)	2	1	1	0	0	4	12
1501-2000	(4)	3	3	3	4	0	0	0	17
2001-2500	3	3	1	0	2	0	0	11	20
2501-3000	2	3	(3)	2	4	1	0	3	18
3001-5000	2	6	6	(5)	(5)	0	0	2	26
5001-10000	0	2	4	4	9	7	0	3	29
10001-25000	1	1	0	2	7	(9)	(4)	0	24
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	5
NONE REC'D	6	7	4	0	4	6	3	17	47
TOTAL	28	42	24	18	40	26	8	51	237
ADJUSTED TOTAL	22	35	20	18	36	20	5	-	
PERCENT									
NONE REC'D	21	17	17	-	10	23	26		

REIMBURSEMENTS, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AMOUNT REQUESTED
AND AMOUNT RECEIVED BY MANUFACTURING FIRMS

DIFFERENCE(\$)	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	COL-PCNT
NONE	10	5	0	2	32	12	5	10	12	6	94	39
-500	2	1	2	2	38	13	4	6	8	2	78	32
501-1000	1	2	0	1	12	2	1	1	2	0	22	9
1001-1500	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	1
1501-2000	1	1	0	0	5	0	0	0	2	0	9	3
2001-2500	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	4	1
2501-3000	1	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	5	2
3001-5000	0	0	0	1	6	0	1	2	0	0	10	4
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	6	2
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	0
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	3	1
TOTAL	15	9	2	7	102	31	12	23	28	8	237	100

REIMBURSEMENTS RECEIVED BY
OTHER, UNKNOWN FIRMS

DOLLARS	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT												TOT COL-PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67			
-500	(4)	(18)	(9)	(3)	(16)	(29)	(16)	(10)	2	0	107	63	
501-1000	1	1	0	0	2	6	4	0	0	0	14	8	
1001-1500	0	0	0	0	3	4	3	2	(3)	0	15	8	
1501-2000	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	0	1	0	7	4	
2001-2500	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	0	5	2	
2501-3000	0	0	0	0	6	1	1	0	0	0	8	4	
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	1	0	6	3	
5001-10000	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0	5	2	
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
NONE REC'D	9	7	2	5	15	9	18	8	17	6	96	0	
TOTAL	14	26	11	9	48	54	44	28	25	6	265	100	
ADJUSTED TOTAL	5	19	9	4	33	45	26	20	8	-			
PERCENT													
NONE REC'D	64	27	18	56	31	17	41	29	68	x			

REIMBURSEMENT RECEIVED BY
OTHER, UNKNOWN FIRMS FOR MOVING COSTS

DOLLARS	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							50+ OVER OR X	TOT COL-PGNT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+		
-500	(19)	(23)	5	0	2	0	0	58	63
501-1000	3	2	(1)	1	0	0	0	7	8
1001-1500	1	2	3	0	(1)	0	0	8	8
1501-2000	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	4
2001-2500	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	2	2
2501-3000	0	2	1	(2)	0	(2)	0	1	4
3001-5000	1	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
5001-10000	0	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	2
10001-25000	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NONE REC'D	15	13	7	3	2	2	0	54	0
TOTAL	42	46	19	9	8	7	0	134	100
ADJUSTED TOTAL	27	33	12	6	6	5			
PERCENT									
NONE REC'D	36	28	37	33	25	29	-	-	-

REIMBURSEMENTS, DIFFERENCE BETWEEN AMOUNT REQUESTED
AND AMOUNT RECEIVED BY OTHER, UNKNOWN FIRMS

DIFFERENCE(\$)	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT	COL-PONT
NONE	8	18	8	5	28	41	30	21	15	2	176	66
-500	3	4	2	1	6	9	9	6	5	4	49	18
501-1000	1	1	1	1	5	2	3	0	2	0	16	6
1001-1500	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	1
1501-2000	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	0	6	2
2001-2500	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	1
2501-3000	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
3001-5000	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3	1
5001-10000	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0
10001-25000	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
25000+, OVER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
TOTAL	14	26	11	9	48	54	44	28	25	6	265	100

SMALL BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT PAYMENTS - 1964 - 1967

BUSINESS TYPE	PAYMENTS		PERCENT OF LOAD	64-67 LOAD
	1500	2500*		
WHOLESALE				
FOOD	5	8	25	51
OTHER	5	13	36	49
RETAIL				
HARDWARE, ETC.	2	2	36	11
DRYGOODS	4	6	47	21
FOOD	8	2	52	19
CLOTHING	2	3	38	13
APPLN., FURN.	3	4	53	13
EATING	3	12	60	25
DRINK, LIQUOR	4	5	60	15
OTHER	8	8	39	41
STORAGE, DISTRIB	2	3	13	36
FINANCE, R.E.	9	3	34	35
PERSONAL SERVICE				
OTHER	13	5	45	40
BARBER, BEAUTY	7	6	76	17
BUS. SERV, PROF.	37	23	41	143
NONPROFIT	0	1	2	36
ROOMING HOUSES	2	0	16	12
MANUFACTURING				
PRINTING	1	1	14	14
FOOD	0	0	0	3
FABRC, APPAREL	0	0	0	7
OTHER	9	10	42	45
UNKNOWN, OTHER	1	2	18	16
TOTAL	125	117	36	662

TIME REQUIRED TO PROCESS CLAIMS, BY TYPE OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS TYPE	TIME IN MONTHS								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6- 10	11- 25	26- OVER
WHOLESALE									
FOOD	0	4	7	2	4	5	4	1	1
OTHER	3	11	21	14	10	7	2	8	3
RETAIL									
HARDWARE, ETC.	0	13	9	8	3	1	1	2	1
DRYGOODS	5	11	9	9	2	1	1	6	0
FOOD	9	17	18	13	7	4	3	6	3
CLOTHING	3	8	16	10	4	1	0	7	1
APPLN., FURN.	3	5	10	7	0	2	1	3	0
EATING	4	8	16	5	4	1	2	3	0
DRINK, LIQUOR	6	13	11	8	9	5	1	1	2
OTHER	7	20	28	13	8	4	3	1	2
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	9	11	2	6	1	0	2	2
FINANCE, R.E.	5	8	7	4	1	1	0	6	2
PERSONAL SERVICE									
OTHER	10	22	24	18	4	5	2	6	2
BARBER, BEAUTY	3	12	10	12	3	1	0	0	1
BUS. SERV, PROF.	9	32	35	33	13	13	4	3	0
NONPROFIT	2	14	7	10	6	1	1	2	1
ROOMING HOUSES	8	20	15	2	0	3	0	0	1
MANUFACTURING									
PRINTING	0	5	3	9	8	3	0	2	1
FOOD	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
FABRC, APPAREL	1	1	6	8	1	2	1	1	0
OTHER	2	16	12	19	13	6	5	5	2
UNKNOWN, OTHER	0	4	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	82	253	278	208	107	68	32	65	25
ROW PCNT (100)	1	10	14	13	21	22	11	7	0

TIME REQUIRED TO RECEIVE SBOP, BY TYPE OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS TYPE	TIME IN MONTHS								
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6- 10	11- 25	26- OVER
WHOLESALE									
FOOD	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	3	1
OTHER	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	2	4
RETAIL									
HARDWARE, ETC.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
DRYGOODS	0	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	1
FOOD	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	4
CLOTHING	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
APPLN., FURN.	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
EATING	0	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	4
DRINK, LIQUOR	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	1	2
OTHER	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	3	6
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1
FINANCE, R.E.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	6
PERSONAL SERVICE									
OTHER	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	2	8
BARBER, BEAUTY	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4	5
BUS. SERV, PROF.	0	0	5	6	1	4	6	18	11
NONPROFIT	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
ROOMING HOUSES	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
MANUFACTURING									
PRINTING	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
FOOD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
FABRIC, APPAREL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OTHER	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	4	4
UNKNOWN, OTHER	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
TOTAL	0	3	14	18	9	14	17	50	66

NUMBER RECEIVED PRIOR TO MOVING .. 1

SIZE OF FIRMS RECEIVING (SBDP),
SMALL BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT PAYMENTS (1964-1967).

BUSINESS TYPE	NO. OF EMPLOYEES							0, 19 49 OVER OR X	TOT TOT-LIQ.	PONT-LIQ
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+ OVER			
WHOLESALE	9	8	7	2	2	1	0	2	31	8 25
RETAIL	25	34	11	1	3	0	0	2	76	41 53
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	5	1 20
SERVICES, PROF.	50	16	10	3	2	0	0	10	91	16 17
MANUFACTURING	4	11	2	0	2	1	0	1	21	2 9
OTHER, UNKNOWN	4	8	2	0	1	0	0	3	18	4 22
TOTAL LOAD	93	78	33	6	10	2	0	20	242	72 29
ROW PERCENTAGES	41	35	14	2	4	0	0	-	100	
TOTAL LIQD.	28	28	7	2	3	0	0	4	72	
PERCENTAGE LIQD.	30	35	21	33	30	0	0	20	29	

SIZE OF FIRMS NOT RECEIVING (SBDP).
SMALL BUSINESS DISPLACEMENT PAYMENTS (1964-1967).

BUSINESS TYPE	NO. OF EMPLOYEES								TOT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	0, OR X	
WHOLESALE	3	12	4	11	22	5	2	10	69
RETAIL	16	27	9	3	10	4	3	10	82
STORAGE, DISTRIB	6	5	0	2	1	1	0	16	31
SERVICES, PROF.	26	31	8	7	12	7	3	15	109
MANUFACTURING	0	5	5	5	11	10	4	8	48
OTHER, UNKNOWN	14	15	6	3	5	3	0	35	81
TOTAL LOAD	65	95	32	31	61	30	12	94	420
ROW PERCENTAGES	19	29	9	9	18	9	3	-	100
TOTAL LIQD.	14	19	3	3	5	0	0	20	64
PERCENTAGE LIQD.	21	20	9	9	8	0	0	21	15

SBA LOANS, BY TYPE OF BUSINESS

BUSINESS TYPE	SBA LOANS		EFFECTIVE RELOCATION LOAD*	PERCENT COVERAGE
	UNDER 15,000	OVER 15,000		
WHOLESALE	1	8	156	5.7
RETAIL	7	12	300	6.3
STORAGE, DISTRIB	1	1	89	2.2
SERVICES, PROF.	3	1	300	1.3
MANUFACTURING	5	6	190	5.8
OTHER, UNKNOWN	1	1	165	1.2
TOTAL	18	29	1200	3.9

*ESTIMATED RELOCATION LOAD SINCE JUNE 30, 1961

NUMBER OF SBA LOANS
BY SIZE OF BUSINESS AS MEASURED BY
SPACE PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

BUSINESS TYPE	AREA IN SQ.FT							
	UNDER 500	500- 0.9K	1K- 2.9K	3K- 4.9K	5K- 9.9K	10K- 20K	20K+	UN- KNOWN
WHOLESALE	0	1	0	0	1	3	4	0
RETAIL	0	2	8	6	1	1	0	1
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
MANUFACTURING	0	0	3	4	1	1	2	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	2	4	14	11	3	5	6	2
ROW PCNT (100)	4.3	8.5	30.0	23.4	6.4	10.6	12.8	4.3

NUMBER OF SBA LOANS

BY SIZE OF BUSINESS AS MEASURED BY
EMPLOYEES PRIOR TO DISPLACEMENT

BUSINESS TYPE	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8- 19	20- 49	50+ OVER	0, OR X	TOT
WHOLESALE	0	0	2	0	3	3	1	0	9
RETAIL	1	6	6	2	3	0	0	1	19
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
SERVICES, PROF.	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	4
MANUFACTURING	0	2	2	1	3	1	2	0	11
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
TOTAL	1	11	12	4	9	4	3	3	47
ROW PCNT (100)	2	23	25	9	19	9	6	6	

WOULD YOU HAVE BEEN ABLE TO REMAIN IN BUSINESS
WITHOUT A REIMBURSEMENT FOR RELOCATION EXPENSES.

BUSINESS TYPE	YES	NO	NONE REC'D	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL
WHOLESALE	24	13	3	1	40
RETAIL	25	14	3	3	42
STORAGE, DISTRIB	2	1	1	1	4
SERVICES, PROF.	47	13	5	6	65
MANUFACTURING	21	18	4	3	43
OTHER, UNKNOWN	17	5	4	4	26
TOTAL	136	64	20	18	220

PERCENTAGES:

BUSINESS TYPE	YES	NO	NONE REC'D	NO RESPONSE
WHOLESALE	60	33	7	-
RETAIL	60	33	7	-
STORAGE, DISTRIB	-	-	-	-
SERVICES, PROF.	72	20	8	-
MANUFACTURING	49	42	8	-
OTHER, UNKNOWN	65	19	16	-
TOTAL	62	29	8	-

WOULD YOU HAVE BEEN ABLE TO REMAIN IN BUSINESS
WITHOUT A REIMBURSEMENT FOR RELOCATION EXPENSES.

NO. OF EMPLOYEES	YES	NO	NONE REC'D	NO RESPONSE	TOTAL LESS NO RESPONSE
ONE	16	8	1	4	25
2 TO 3	22	13	2	5	37
4 TO 5	23	10	3	1	36
6 TO 7	14	5	1	0	20
8 TO 19	29	16	3	1	48
20 TO 49	15	5	2	4	22
50+, CVER	5	2	0	0	7
0, UNKNOWN	12	5	8	3	25
TOTAL	136	64	20	18	

PERCENTAGES

ONE	64	32	4	-
2 TO 3	59	35	6	-
4 TO 5	64	28	8	-
6 TO 7	70	25	5	-
8 TO 19	60	33	7	-
20 TO 49	68	23	9	-
50+, OVER	71	29	-	-
0, UNKNOWN	48	20	32	-
TOTAL	62	29	9	-

SURVEY FIRMS RESPONSE TO QUESTION
CONCERNING THE AMOUNT OF COMPENSATION RECEIVED.

RESPONSE	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT
ADEQUATE	0	0	0	0	18	11	15	23	30	4	101
INADEQUATE	2	3	1	4	34	19	11	20	22	3	119
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	3	3	2	3	5	2	18
TOTAL	2	3	1	4	55	33	28	46	57	9	238
ROW PCNT (100)	-	-	-	-	23	14	12	19	24	4	

	PRIOR 64		AFTER 63	
	TOT	PCNT	TOT	PCNT
ADEQUATE	29	32	72	56
INADEQUATE	63	68	56	44
NO RESPONSE	6	-	12	-
TOTAL	98	100	140	100

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE TO THE ADEQUACY
OF THE COMPENSATION RECEIVED.*

BUSINESS TYPE	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	N/A	TOTAL
WHOLESALE	16	23	2	41
RETAIL	9	34	2	45
STORAGE, DISTRIB	2	2	1	5
SERVICES, PRCF.	38	27	6	71
MANUFACTURING	22	20	4	46
OTHER, UNKNOWN	14	13	3	30
TOTAL	101	119	18	238

PERCENTAGES

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE TO THE ADEQUACY
OF THE COMPENSATION RECEIVED.*

BUSINESS TYPE	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	N/A	TOTAL
WHOLESALE	39	56	4	100
RETAIL	20	75	4	100
STORAGE, DISTRIB	40	40	20	100
SERVICES, PRCF.	53	38	8	100
MANUFACTURING	47	43	8	100
OTHER, UNKNOWN	46	43	10	100
TOTAL	42	50	7	100

**QUESTION= DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU RECEIVED ADEQUATE
COMPENSATION TO HELP YOU MAKE A SUCCESSFUL MOVE.

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE TO THE ADEQUACY
OF THE COMPENSATION RECEIVED.*

NO. EMPLOYEES	PERCENTAGES			N/A TOTAL	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE	N/A TOTAL
	ADEQUATE	INADEQUATE					
ONE	18	9	2	29	67	33	-
2 TO 3	19	20	3	42	49	51	-
4 TO 5	17	15	5	37	53	47	-
6 TO 7	9	11	0	20	45	55	-
8 TO 19	23	22	4	49	51	49	-
20 TO 49	6	19	1	26	24	76	-
50+, CVER	3	3	1	7	50	50	-
0, UNKNOWN	6	20	2	28	23	77	-
TOTAL	101	119	18	238	46	54	-

**QUESTION: DO YOU FEEL THAT YOU RECEIVED ADEQUATE
COMPENSATION TO HELP YOU MAKE A SUCCESSFUL MOVE.

SURVEY RESPONSE...

RELOCATION HELP PROVIDED BY THE LPA

BUSINESS TYPE	FRIENDLY, CO-OPERATIVE	INFORMATION ON LOANS, CLAIMS	FOUND LOCATION
WHOLESALE	9	4	0
RETAIL	12	3	1
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	19	8	0
MANUFACTURING	4	1	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	9	5	0
TOTAL	53	21	1

SURVEY RESPONSE...

SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS IN RELOCATION PROCEEDURES

BUSINESS TYPE	SUGGESTIONS						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
WHOLESALE	0	3	4	2	1	0	0
RETAIL	0	7	4	1	2	1	1
STORAGE, DISTRIB	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
SERVICES, PROF.	0	3	5	2	1	1	0
MANUFACTURING	0	2	6	0	1	0	0
OTHER, UNKNOWN	0	0	3	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	0	15	23	5	6	2	1

SUGGESTIONS:

- 1 - More money
- 2 - Less red tape
- 3 - Keep out politics and corruption
- 4 - a. Estimate date closer to taking
b. Too little time
c. Too much time
- 5 - Make payments on account
- 6 - Pay for good will
- 7 - Information, advice

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE =
TO THE WAY IN WHICH RELOCATION WAS HANDLED.

ATTITUDES	NO. OF EMPLOYEES								TOT
	1	2-3	4-5	6-7	8-19	20-49	50+ OVER	0, OR X	
FINE - POSITIVE	12	11	13	7	13	7	4	4	71
NEUTRAL	11	16	12	6	16	7	3	10	81
NEGATIVE	2	9	9	7	13	10	0	12	62
NO RESPONSE	4	6	3	0	7	2	0	2	24
TOTAL	29	42	37	20	49	26	7	28	238

PERCENTAGES

[illegible]

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE =
TO THE WAY IN WHICH RELOCATION WAS HANDLED.

WHOLESALE ATTITUDES	BUSINESS FIRMS										TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
FINE - POSITIVE	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	5	0	11	29
NEUTRAL	0	0	0	1	(3)	(1)	(2)	(2)	(5)	1	15	39
NEGATIVE	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	2	4	1	12	32
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	3	-
TOTAL	0	0	0	3	9	4	3	6	14	2	41	100

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE =
TO THE WAY IN WHICH RELOCATION WAS HANDLED.

ATTITUDES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
FINE - POSITIVE	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	1	6	15
NEUTRAL	1	0	0	0	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)	0	13	33
NEGATIVE	0	2	0	0	7	4	3	2	3	0	21	52
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	5	-
TOTAL	1	2	0	0	14	9	6	5	7	1	45	100

RETAIL BUSINESS FIRMS

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE =
TO THE WAY IN WHICH RELOCATION WAS HANDLED.

STORAGE, DISTRIB BUSINESS FIRMS

ATTITUDES	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	TOT
FINE - POSITIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
NEUTRAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
NEGATIVE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE =
TO THE WAY IN WHICH RELOCATION WAS HANDLED.

SERVICES, PROF. BUSINESS FIRMS

ATTITUDES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
FINE - POSITIVE	0	0	0	0	2	1	3	(12)	(9)	1	28	40
NEUTRAL	1	0	0	0	2	(4)	(5)	7	5	1	25	38
NEGATIVE	0	1	0	1	(5)	2	1	2	1	0	13	20
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	5	-
TOTAL	1	1	0	1	10	9	10	22	15	2	71	100

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE =
TO THE WAY IN WHICH RELOCATION WAS HANDLED.

ATTITUDES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT										TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67		
FINE - POSITIVE	0	0	0	0	2	1	(2)	(5)	(6)	1	17	40
NEUTRAL	0	0	0	0	5	(4)	0	1	3	1	14	34
NEGATIVE	0	0	0	0	(6)	1	1	1	2	0	11	26
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	4	-
TOTAL	0	0	0	0	15	6	4	8	11	2	46	100

SUBJECTIVE RESPONSE =
TO THE WAY IN WHICH RELOCATION WAS HANDLED.

OTHER, UNKNOWN BUSINESS FIRMS

ATTITUDES	DATE OF DISPLACEMENT							TOT	COL PCNT
	58	59	60	61	62	63	64		
FINE - POSITIVE	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	9	36
NEUTRAL	0	0	1	0	(3)	(3)	(3)	13	52
NEGATIVE	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	12
NO RESPONSE	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	5	-
TOTAL	0	0	1	0	7	5	5	30	100

APPENDIX VI

EXHIBITS

- A. Survey Form
- B. Letter of Transmittal

Space for comments has been provided at the end of the questionnaire. If it is insufficient, please feel free to use the back of the sheet.

1. How do you feel about the way in which your relocation was handled?
Please check: (Fine-positive _____)(Neutral _____)(Negative _____)

2. Did you experience any of the following: Please check them.

delays in receiving relocation payments _____
business interruption _____
loss of income prior to property taking _____
loss of customers _____
unreasonable time lag between the project
announcement and the property taking _____

3. Do you feel that you received adequate compensation to help you make a successful move? (Yes _____)(No _____)

4. Would you have been able to remain in business without a reimbursement for relocation expenses? (Yes _____)(No _____)(None received _____)

5. What were your major problems in finding a new location: Please check.

zoning restrictions	_____	delays or time consumed	_____
licensing problems	_____	leasing	_____
unsuitable building space	_____	financing	_____
unreasonable rents	_____	costs	_____
hurried, not enough time	_____	unsuitable location	_____
other	_____		

6. How long did it take you to find a new location? _____ months.

7. What means did you use to find a new location? Please check them.

located by self	_____	real estate agent	_____
through friends	_____	relocation agency	_____
other businessmen	_____	other	_____

8. What is your trading area (where are your customers located)?

(Neighborhood _____)(Boston _____)(Metro Area _____)(New England _____)

9. Do you serve any particular racial or ethnic group? (Yes _____)(No _____)

If yes, which? _____

10. How long have you been in business? _____ years.

OVER PLEASE

11. Are you satisfied with the progress you are making at your new location? Please check.

(Very satisfied _____)(Satisfied _____)(Very Dissatisfied _____)

12. How do you like doing business here rather than at the old location? Please check the following.

	Better here	The same	Old better
general business			
costs			
parking			
access			
merchandise handling			
working space and layout			
other			

13. Upon relocation did you change: (Please check)

your method of operation _____

your type of business _____

drop or add any line, services, or products _____

14. Upon moving did you improve your layout, rearrange equipment, or generally make changes to improve operating efficiency? (Yes __)(No __)

15. How many employees did you have just after moving? _____.

16. How many employees do you have now? _____.

17. How much floor space do you now use? _____ Sq. Ft., on how many floors? (Ground floor _____)(Others _____)

18. Do you now (own _____)(rent _____) and your monthly rent is _____.

19. Have your gross annual receipts or sales increased? (Yes _____) or (No _____). By what percentage: _____%.

20. Did you find any of the services of the Business Relocation Department helpful? (Yes _____)(No _____). If yes, in what ways?

21. Would you please make any suggestions or comments as to how relocation activities might be improved?

22. Name and title of person answering the survey:

THANK YOU



MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY

209 West Newton Street
Boston, Massachusetts
March 23, 1967

Gentlemen:

I am writing a graduate thesis on 'Relocation Services in Urban Renewal' for a masters at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. In order to get the personal reactions of relocatees, both positive and negative, I have prepared a series of questions to which your answers will be very important.

All information which you provide will of course remain strictly confidential. It is my hope to use this information in improving the conditions under which future business relocation is conducted. The final report should become available to you, through the M.I.T. libraries, by June of this year.

This survey is not related to any others in which you may have participated. I would appreciate it very much if you would be kind enough to participate and to answer the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed reply envelope. If you would do this within the next few days it would be extremely helpful.

Sincerely yours,

Joe L. Ward

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alevizos, John P. An Effective Program for the Relocation of Businesses from Urban Renewal Areas. (Unpublished report prepared under a URA Demonstration Grant), Boston, 1963(?).

Churchill, Betty C. "Recent Business Population Movements", Survey of Current Business, Vol. 34, No. 1, January 1954, pp. 11-16.

The Displacement of Small Business from a Slum Clearance Area - The Experience in Mount Royal Plaza, Baltimore, Maryland. (Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Agency),

The Failure Record Through 1960. (Dun and Bradstreet, Inc.), New York, 1961.

Handbook for Participation Loans with the Small Business Administration. Small Business Administration, Washington, 1966.

Harris, Stephen M. "Business Relocation Programs Would Benefit from More Intensive Local Efforts within a Framework of Broader Federal Guidance", Journal of Housing, Vol. 23, No. 3, March 1966, pp. 147-149.

Hearings Before the Subcommittee No. 5 of the Select Committee on Small Business, (House of Representatives, 89th Congress, 1st Session, Pursuant to House Res. 13, Vol. 1), Washington, 1965.

Industrial and Commercial Business Relocation in the City of Boston, (Boston Redevelopment Authority - Staff Report), Boston, 1966.

Kinnard, William N., and Malinowski, Zenon S. The Impact of Dislocation from Urban Renewal Areas on Small Business. University of Connecticut, 1960.

Kinnard, William N. Statement to the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, (Committee on Public Works, United States House of Representatives, Providence, (1964) reprint, University of Connecticut.

Local Public Agency Letter No. 80 (Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency), October 8, 1956.

Local Public Agency Letter No. 134. (Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency), March 14, 1958.

Local Public Agency Letter No. 362 (Urban Renewal Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development), February 10, 1966.

Olins, A. M. Characteristics and Trends of Boston's Labor Force. (Boston Redevelopment Authority, unpub. MS), Boston, 1967.

Organization and Operation of the Small Business Administration: A Report of the Select Committee on Small Business. (House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, House Report No. 1935), Washington, 1964.

Platt, Rutherford H. Background Paper No. 1, Changing Congressional Provisions for Small Businesses Displaced by Urban Renewal. (Center for Urban Studies), Chicago, 1966.

Questions and Answers on Relocation Payments. (Advisory Bulletin, AB-5-58, HHFA, URA), Washington, 1958.

Relocation: Unequal Treatment of People and Businesses Displaced by Government. (Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations), Washington, 1965.

Report on the Removal and Relocation of the Charlestown Elevated Rapid Transit Structure. (Boston Redevelopment Authority), Boston.

Saalberg, James H. A Study of Business Dislocation Caused by the Boston Central Artery. Unpublished M.I.T. City Planning Thesis, Cambridge, 1959.

Schorr, Philip. "Relocation 'Bill of Rights'," Journal of Housing, Vol. 17, No. 9, October 1960, pp. 367-368.

Small Business Problems in Urban Areas. (Hearings before Subcommittee No. 5, 89th Congress, Vol. 4, New York, 1965), Washington, 1966.

Study of Compensation and Assistance for Persons Affected by Real Property Acquisition in Federal and Federally Assisted Programs, (Committee on Public Works, House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 2nd Session), Washington, 1964.

Success and Failure Factors in Small Business. (Small Business Administration), Washington, 1964.

Urban Renewal Manual. (Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency), Washington,

Urban Renewal Plan, Washington Park Renewal Area, Project No. Mass. R-24. (Boston Redevelopment Authority), Boston, January 1963.

Urban Renewal Project Characteristics. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, December, 1965.

West End Project Report: A Preliminary Redevelopment Study of the West End of Boston. (Urban Redevelopment Division, Boston Housing Authority), Boston, 1953.

Zimmer, Basil G. Rebuilding Cities - The Effects of Displacement and Relocation on Small Business. Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1964.

